# Theology <br> the eb.org.uk 

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee
https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON

## ST PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

## Uambrioge:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESE.

# ST PAUL'S EPISTLES T0 THE THESSALONIANS : 

WITH A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY, AND A REVISED TRANSLATION,

## CHARLES J. ELLICOTT D.D. bishop of gloucebter and bitstol.

## THE FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:
LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS \& GREEN. 1880.

## PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

AVERY slight amount of change has been found necessary during the revision of this volume for the new edition. It is however brought fully up to the standard adopted in the Third Edition of the Pastoral Epistles, especially as regards the Translation.

It is as well to call the reader's attention once for all to the fact that in these two Epistles the Codex Ephraemi only contains ch. i. 2-ii. 8 of the First Epistle. This has been often noticed in the critical notes, but not invariably.

## Gloucester,

April, 1866.

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE present edition differs but little from the first. There will be found however traces of a regular and deliberate revision on every page. Scriptural references have been again verified; readings and interpretations have been carefully reconsidered, and the grammatical principles on which the interpretations appear to rest tested by fresh investigation. Though the result is a very small amount of change, yet the amount of time thus spent in reconsideration has not been wholly thrown away; as the Commentary is now presented anew to the reader with a humble yet increased confidence in the general soundness of the principles on which it is based.

## Exeter,

December, I861.

## PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE present volume forms the fifth part of my Commentary on St Paul's Epistles, and is constructed as nearly as possible on the same plan as the portion which appeared last year, viz. that containing the Epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. I particularly specify this, as I have been informed by friends on whose judgment I can rely that the last portion of my labours is an improvement on those which preceded it.

If I may venture to assume that this is really the case, I cannot help feeling that it is to be attributed not only to increased experience, but also to the cautious but somewhat freer admixture of exegesis which two of the three Epistles contained in the volume seemed more especially to require. This slight modification, and so to say dilution, of the critical and grammatical severity which distinguished the earlier parts of the work has been continued in the present volume, but it has been done both watchfully and cautiously, and will be really seen more in the way of slight addition than in actual change. Time and experience both seem to show that the system of interpretation that I have been enabled to pursue is substantially sound, that plain and patient accuracy in detail does in most cases lead to hopeful results, and serves not unfrequently to guide us to far loftier and more ennobling views of the Word of Life than such an unpretending method might at first prepare us to expect.

The modifications then, or rather additions and expansions, are really slight, and may be briefly summed up under two heads; on the one hand, an attempt to elucidate more clearly the connexion of clauses and the general sequence of thought; and on the other hand, an attempt to develop more completely the dogmatical significance of passages of a more profound and more purely theological import. Neither of

## viii PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

these portions of sacred interpretation was neglected in the early parts of this Commentary, but in the present a deepening sense of their extreme importance has suggested this further expansion and development.

A few slight additions to other departments of the Commentary may be briefly noticed.

To the ancient Versions which I have been in the habit of consulting, viz. the Old Latin, the Peshito, the Gothic, the Coptic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and the two Ethiopic Versions, I did not think it would be necessary for me ever to make any addition. I have been convinced however by the able notice of the Armenian Version in Horne's Introduction by my learned acquaintance Dr Tregelles that this venerable Version has greater claims on our attention than I had before believed. In spite of the excellent edition of Zohrab, I had shared the opinion entertained by the majority of critics that the once-called 'Queen of the Versions' had but slender claims to that supremacy, and had suffered so much from Latinizing recensions as to be but of doubtful authority. The charges which have been brought against the labours of King Haithom in the thirteenth century, and the readings adopted by the collator Uscan in the seventeenth, tended of late years to awaken the suspicions of critical scholars. It is fair however to say that the charges of Latinism do not appear to be well founded, and that this ancient Version deserves the attention of the critic and commentator; still, if I am not presumptuous in hazarding an opinion, I do seem to myself to perceive a generally Occidental tinge in its interpretations, and I have more than once verified the observation of Loebe and De Gabelentz that there are coincidences and accordances with the Gothic Version that seem to be not wholly accidental. My knowledge however is at present too limited to enable me to speak with confidence.

I have then deemed it my duty to make use of this Version, and to acquire such a knowledge of the language as should enable me to state faithfully its opinion in contested passages. To the student who may feel attracted towards this interesting, highly inflected, yet not very difficult language, I will venture to recommend the Grammar and Dictionary of Aucher ${ }^{1}$. The former is now selling at a low price, and can easily be procured. Its great defect is in the

[^0][^1]syntax, which I cannot think very clearly or scientifically arranged; and in the Chrestomathy, which is not at first sufficiently easy and progressive. The extracts, though curious, are not well suited for a beginner, and are not introduced by any elementary lessons in parsing and grammatical application. A strong sense of the value of such aids reminds me that I may not unsuitably take this opportunity of recommending the Coptic Grammar of Uhlemann. It is extremely well arranged, is brief and perspicuous, and besides a good progressive Chrestomathy is furnished with a small but very useful Vocabulary.

I again venture to commend these ancient Versions to the attention of all students who have leisure, and an aptitude for the acquisition of languages. It is startling to find how little we really know of these ancient witnesses, how erroneous are the current statements of their mere readings, how neglected their authority in interpretation. And yet we see on all sides critical editions of the sacred volume multiplying, and, in at least one instance (I regret to say that I allude to the otherwise useful editions of Dr Tischendorf), can abundantly verify the fact that Latin translations, not always trustworthy or exact, have been the main authorities from which the readings have been derived. Is it too much to demand of a critical editor, of one who is by the very nature of his work free from the many distractions of thought that are the lot of the commentator,-is it too much to demand that he should consider it a part of his duties to acquire himself such a knowledge of these languages as to be able to tell us plainly and unmistakeably what are and what are not the true readings of these early and invaluable witnesses? Nay more, it is, and it will ever be, of paramount importance that the loyal critic should use no eyes but his own. He may endeavour to procure collations from others, he may try to proceed on the principle of division of labour, but he will I firmly believe ultimately be forced to admit that this is one of those cases in which labour cannot be well divided, and in which the mechanically-made comparisons of the associated collator can never be put in the same rank with the results of the intelligent search of the professed critic. The very interest that the latter feels in what he is looking for protects him to a great degree from those inaccuracies which the mere collator can never hope entirely to escape; added to which, his exact knowledge of the variations of the reading at issue will save him as nothing else can from confounding merely a greater inclusiveness of meaning with evidences of distinct textual change. To cite a single and
familiar instance,-how often must the critical scholar have observed that Oriental Versions are adduced on one side or other in such cases of prepositional variation as $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\delta a \dot{\prime}$, when the plain fact is that the greater inclusiveness of the Beth or Bet of the Version leaves the actual reading which the translator had before him a matter of complete uncertainty. Are then our scholars, and more especially our critics, to shrink from such a useful and even necessary duty as the study of the ancient Versions? Are a certain number of weary hours, more or less, to be set in comparison with the ability and the privilege of making clearly known to others the critical characteristics of Versions of the Book of Life that have been the blessed media of salvation to early churches and to ancient nations?

One word, and one word only, as to my own humble, most humble efforts in this particular province. Time, toil, and patience, have done something; and though, alas, my knowledge is still limited, yet I may at length venture to hope that in most of these Versions the student may fully rely on my statements, and that the number of those statements that may hereafter be reversed by wiser and better scholars than myself will not be very large. I am forced to say this, as I have observed in one or two reviews with which I have been favoured, that avowals of inexperience, which seemed the more suitable and becoming in proportion as the means of detecting it were in fewer hands, have been understood to imply that my citations from these ancient authorities confessedly could not be relied on. This however has not been and is not the case. While I sensitively shrink from dragging into notice the amount of my own labours, I still perceive that I must beware of leading the reader to pass over what may be of real use to him, and of feeling distrust where actually there may be no just ground for it. The intelligent scholar will see at a glance that to state fairly and correctly the translation of words of which the subject is familiarly known is a task which certainly does not lie beyond the reach of ordinary patience and industry.

Among other additions the reader will I trust be benefited by the still increasing attention paid to our best English divinity. I have made it my study to refer especially to sermons on all the more interesting and difficult verses, and it is unusually cheering to find that no portion of my labours has been more kindly appreciated, or has apparently been of more real service to theological students. Without drawing any unfair comparison between English and German divinity, it does not seem one whit too much to say that if we are
often indebted to the latter for patient and laborious exegesis, it is to the former alone that we must go if we would fain add to our mere contextual knowledge some true perceptions of the analogy of Scripture, and are really and sincerely interested in striving to comprehend all the profound and mysterious harmonies of Catholic Truth.

With regard to matters of textual criticism, the student will observe in this volume the same persistent attention to the principal differences of reading, even in the grammatical notes. My constant effort is to popularize this sort of knowledge, to make exegesis lend it a helping hand, and insensibly to decoy the student into examining and considering for himself what human words seem to have the best claims to be regarded as the earthly instruments by which the adorable mercies of God have been made known to the children of men. These notices, it must be remembered, are merely selected, and neither are nor are intended to be enumerations of all the differences of reading; still I have good hope that no reading that deserves attention has been overlooked.

I have now only to conclude with a few notices of those works to which I am especially indebted. The list is gradually becoming shorter. I have been enabled to use so many more first-class authorities than when I commenced this series, that it does not seem disrespectful to omit silently such as can be fairly considered second-class from pages where text and notes only too often stand in an undesirable though unavoidable disproportion.

In these Epistles, as in the Pastoral Epistles, I have lost the sagacious guidance of Dr Meyer; I have not however so much to lament the change of editor as in the Epistles above alluded to. Though distinctly inferior to Meyer, especially in the critical and graminatical portion of his work, Dr Lünemann is still a commentator of a very high order. His exegesis is usually sound and convincing, and no one, I am sure, can beneficially study these two beautiful Epistles without having at hand the Commentary of this able editor.

The larger and more comprehensive Commentaries will be found specified in former portions of this work, but I must pause to express my hearty sense of the continued excellence of my friend Dean Alford's Commentary. As our readers will see, we occasionally break a friendly lance, more especially in matters of detail. These gentle encounters however are not only unavoidable but even desirable. It is by all such amicable conflicts of opinion that the truth, often lying midway between those engaged in her defence, is most surely seen and recognised.

Of the separate editions of these Epistles I desire to specify the very able Commentaries of Pelt and Schott. The former of these two writers has the great merit of being one of the first of later times who distinctly felt the importance of using the exegetical works of the Greek Fathers, and the latter supplies a good specimen of that patient mode of grammatical interpretation which has now obtained such general currency. Though both these works have been many years before the world, and though in many cases their opinions have been reversed by more modern expositors, they can neither of them be justly considered as superseded or antiquated.

Last of all I come to the edition of Professor Jowett. And here I would rather that our differences of opinion appeared in their respective places than were specifically alluded to. I feel it however a duty to speak, and it is with pain that I must record my fixed opinion that the system of interpretation pursued by Professor Jowett is as dangerous as I believe it to be inaccurate and untenable. After making every possible allowance for the obvious fact that our systems of interpretation are completely and persistently antagonistic, after willingly making in my own case every correction for bias, I still feel morally convinced that the objections to Professor Jowett's system of interpretation are such as cannot be evaded or explained away. After having thus performed a very painful duty, I trust I may be permitted to express my full recognition of the genius that pervades his writings, the ease, finish, and, alas, persuasiveness of the style, the kindly though self-conscious spirit that animates his teaching, and the love of truth that, however sadly and deeply wounded by paradoxes and polemics, still seems to be ever both felt and cultivated. May these good gifts be dedicated anew to the service of Divine Truth and be overruled to more happy and more chastened issues.

It now only remains for me with all humility and lowliness of heart to lay this work before the Great Father of Lights, imploring His blessing on what I may have said aright, and His mercy where my eyes have been holden, and where I have not been permitted to see clearly all the blessed lineaments of Divine Truth.

TPIAE, MONAE, EAEHEON.

## MPOУ OEESAMONIKEID A.

## INTRODUCTION.

THIS calm, practical, and profoundly consolatory Epistle was written by the Apostle to his converts in the wealthy and populous city of Thessalonica not long after his first visit to Macedonia (Acts xvi. 9), when in conjunction with Silas and Timothy he laid the foundations of the Thessalonian Church (Acts xvii. I sq.). See notes on ch. i. r.

The exact time of writing the Epistle appears to have been the early months of the Apostle's year and a half stay at Corinth (Acts xviii. ri), soon after Timothy had joined him (i Thess. iii. 6) and reported the spiritual state of their converts, into which he had been sent to enquire (ch. iii. 2), probably from Athens; see notes on ch. iii. r. We may thus consider the close of A.D. $5^{2}$, or the beginning of A.D. 53 , as the probable date, and, if this be correct, must place the Epistle first on the chronological list of the Apostle's writiogs.

The arguments in favour of a later date are based either on passages which have been thought to imply that the Apostle had preached the Gospel for some time elsewhere (ch. i. 8), or on statements in the Epistle (ch. iv. 13, v. 12; see 2 Thess. iii. 17) which have been judged to be in accordance with a greater interval between the time of the first preaching at Thessalonica and the date of the Epistle than is usually assigned. These have all been satisfactorily answered by Davidson (Introd. Vol. II. p. 435), and have met with no acceptance at the hands of recent expositors or chronologers ; comp. Lünemann, Einleitung, p. 6, Wieseler, Chronol. p. 40 sq.

The main object of the Apostle in writing this Epistle can easily be gathered from some of the leading expressions. It was designed alike to console and to admonish ;-to console, with
reference both to recent external trials and afflictions (ch. ii. 14 sq. ), and still more to internal trials arising from anxieties as to the state of their departed friends (ch. iv. I3 sq.) ;-to admonish, with reference to grave moral principles (ch. iv. I sq.), Christian watchfulness (ch. v. i sq.), and various practical duties (ch. v. 14) which had been neglected owing to the feverish expectations and anxieties which appear to have prevailed at Thessalonica even from the first: comp. ch. iv. in, and see notes in loc. St Paul had heard of all these things from Timothy; and this information, combined with the Apostle's full consciousness that there were many points both in knowledge and practice in which they were deficient (ch. iii. Io) and on which he would fain have further taught them personally (comp. ch. ii. 17 sq.), appears to have called forth this instructive and strengthening Epistle.

The authenticity and genuineness of the Epistle are placed beyond all reasonable doubt both by clear external testimonies (Irenæus, Hœr. v. 6. ı, Clem.-Alex. Padag. i. p. ıog, ed. Potter, Tertullian, de Resurr. Carn. cap. 24) and by still stronger internal arguments derived from the style and tone of thought. The objections that have been urged against it, like those advanced against the Second Epistle (see Introd.), may justly be pronounced rash, arbitrary, and unworthy of serious consideration. They will be found fully answered in Davidson, Introd. Vol. II. p. 454 sq.

## IIPOX OEESAAONIKEIS A.

Apostolic address and salutation.

$\Pi$


I. חav̂los] The absence of the official designation a $\pi \sigma \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda$ os in the salutations of these Epp. is not due to their early date, nor to the fact that the title had not yet been assumed by St Paul (comp. Jowett), but simply to the terms of affection that subsisted between St Paul and his converts at Thessalonica, and their loving recognition of his office and authority ; comp. Beng. in loc., and see notes on Phil. i. 1. The reason of Chrys., followed by Theoph. and Eicum., סid тd עєокат $\eta$ -
 aủzô̂ $\pi \in \hat{\rho} \rho \alpha \nu$ ei $\lambda \eta \phi \epsilon \nu \alpha$, does not seem sufficient. That it was 'propter reverentiam Silvani' (Cajet., Est.) is far from probable, for comp. 1 and 2 Cor. i. I , Col. i. I. $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ inovavós] Identical with Silas mentioned in the Acts (comp. Acts xvi. I9 sq. with I Thess. ii. r, 2, and Acts xviii. 5 with 2 Cor.

 of Jerusalem (ver. 22), and also probably a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37) : he was sent by the Apostles and elders of that Church with St Paul and St Earnabas to Antioch, and, after first returning to Jerusalem (ver. 33), accompanied the former on his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 40) through Asia Minor to Macedonia. There he co-operates with the Apostle
(Acts xvii. 4) and Timothy (comp. Acts xvi. 3, xvii. 14, I Thess. iii. 6) in founding the Church of Thessalonica, and after staying behind at Berœa (Acts xvii. 14) rejoins St Paul either at Athens or Corinth, and actively preaches the Gospel in the last named city (2 Cor. i. 19). It does not seem improbable that he afterwards joined St Peter, and is identical with the Silvanus mentioned in i Pet. v. 12 ; compare Bleek on Hebr. Vol. I. p. 408. He is here placed before Timothy (so also Acts xvii. 14, 15 , xviii. 5, 2 Cor. i. 19, 2 Thess. i. r), as being probably the older man, and certainly the older associate of St Paul. According to tradition, Silas was afterwards Bishop of Corinth, and Silvanus of Thessalonica (compare the list in Fabric. Lux Evang. p. 117); the former name however, though paroxytone, is in all probability only a contracted form of the latter; see Winer, $G r . \S$ i6. note 1, p. 93. For further and legendary notices of Silas, see Acta Sanct. July 13, Vol. III. p. 476, and for an attempt to identify Silas with St Luke, see Journal of Sacr. Lit. Oct. 1850, p. 328 sq . Tıróteos] The name of this convert is too well known to need more than a brief notice. He was the son of a Greek

##  cipinın．

father and a Jewish mother（Acts xvi． 1， 2 Tim．i．5），most probably from Lystra，and perhaps converted by St Paul on bis first visit to that city （Acts xiv． 8 sq．）．He accompanied the Apostle on his second missionary journey to Macedonia，remains behind at Beroea（Acts xvii．14），is summoned by St Paul when at Athens；pro－ bably rejoins him there（comp．i Thess． iii．I，2，and see Neander，Planting， Vol．I．p．195），is despatched to Thes－ salonica，and returns to the Apostle at Corinth（Acts xviii．5）．After an interval，he reappears in St Paul＇s third missionary jourvey，and is sent from Ephesus to Macedonia（Acts xix． 22）and Corinth（I Cor．iv．17）．He was with St Paul when he wrote 2 Cor．（i．I）and Rom．（xvi．2I），accom－ panied him from Corinth to Asia （Acts xx．4），and subsequently was with him when he wrote Pbil．（i．I）， Col．（i．I），and Philem．（ver．1）．He appears afterwards to have been left in charge of the Church at Ephesus （ $\mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{i} .3$ ），and finally is summoned by St Paul to Rome，at the close of the Apostle＇s second imprisonment． $\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{e}}$ is named by Eusebius（Hist．Eccl． III．4，comp．Const．A post．vit．46）as first bishop of Ephesus，and is said to lave suffered martyrdom under Do－ mitian ；see Phot．Billioth．ccliv． p． 1402 （ed．Hoesch．），Acta Sanct．， Jan．24，Vol．II．p． 562 ，and Menolog． Grac．Vol．II．p．i28．It may be remarked that Silvanus and Timothy are here named with St Paul，not merely as being then with him（comp． Gal．i．2），or as the＇socii salutationis＇ （see notes on Phil．i．1），but also as having co－operated with him in found－ ing the Church of Thessalonica． тn̂ éккл．Oєбба入．к．т．入．］＇to the

Church of the Thessalonians in God the Father，＇\＆c．；not＇scribunt aut mittunt hanc epistolam＇（Est．），but in the usual elliptical form of greeting （Lucian，Conviv．§ 22），the $\chi$ alpet （James i．r）being involved and im－ plied in the wish（ $\chi^{d} \rho \iota 5$ к．т．入．）which forms the second period of the saluta－ tion ：see notes on I Tim．i． 2.
Thessalonica was a Iarge（Lucian， Asin．§ 40），wealthy，and populous city（Strabo，Geogr．vil．7．4，Vol．in． p．60，ed．Kramer），at the north－east corner of the Sinus Thermaicus．It was built on the site of or near to （Pliny，Hist．Nat．iv． 10 ［17］，ed． Sillig）the ancient Therme（Herod． viI．121，Thucyd．I．6I）by Cassander， in honour of his wife $\Theta \epsilon \sigma \sigma a \lambda o \nu i k \eta$ （Strabo，Geogr．viI．Fragm．21，Vol． II．p．79，ed．Kram．），and under the Romans was of sufficient importance to be chosen first as the capital of the second district of Macedonia，and afterwards，when the four districts were united，of the whole province： see notes on ver． 7 ，and Livy，xlv． 29. It afterwards became a libera civitas （Pliny，l．c．）．It retained its import－ ance through the middle ages（see Conyb，and Howson，St Paul，Vol．I． p． 345 \＆q．，ed．I），and even at the present day，under the name of Salo－ niki，is one of the chief cities of European Turkey：see Leake，$N$ ． Greece，Vol．III．p． 238 sq．For fur－ ther notices，see the good account of Conyb．and Hows．l．c．，Winer，RWR． Vol．in．p．608，Pauly，Real Encycl． Vol．vi．p．1880，and especially the learned and comprehensive treatise of Tafel，de Thessal．ejusque agro，Berol．
 must be closely joined with $\tau \hat{\eta}$ És $\kappa \lambda$ ． $\Theta \varepsilon \sigma \sigma .$, to which it stands in the rela－
 spiritual progress The manner in which we preached and ye heard preached and ye heard is now well known unto all men.
tion of a kind of tertiary predicate (Donalds. Gr. § 489 ), and which it serves to distinguish from the $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a i$
 (Chrys.) which were in that city; $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ $\theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \pi a \tau \rho l$, as De Wette suggests, distinguishing it from the latter, кai K $\nu \rho$. к.т.д., from the former. To connect these words with whatfollows (Koppe), or to understand रalpeıv 入érouà (Schott,-not Winer [Alf.], who expressly adopts the right view) is arbitrary and untenable, and to supply $\tau \hat{\eta}$ or $\tau \hat{\eta}$ ouvan (De W., Alf., comp. Chrys., Syr.) unnecessary and even inexact, such unions without an art. being by no means uncommon in the N.T.; see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123, and for the principle of such combinations, notes on Eph. i. 15 . Commentators call attention to th* fact that the term $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda$. occurs only in the addresses to 1 and 2 Thess., 1 and 2 Cor., and Gal., while in the supposed later Epp. Ruıu., Eph., Phil., Col., the more individualizing roîs ajous к.т. $\lambda$. is adopted. The variation is slightly noticeable; it does not however seem to point to gradually altered views with regard to the attributes of the Church (Jowett), but merely to the present comparative paucity of numbers (compare Chrys.), and their aggregation in a single assembly; comp. Koch, p. 56, note. On the meaning and application of the term, see Pearson, Creed, Art. ix. Vol. i. p. 397 (ed. Burt.), Jackson, Creed, xII. 2. I sq. Xápıs ípîv к.т. $\lambda$.] Scil. $\epsilon^{\tau} \eta$, not $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \omega$ (Schott) ; see notes on Eph. i. 2. On the blended form of Greek and Hebrew greeting, see notes on Gal. i. 3, Eph. i. 2. The reading is somewhat doubtful: Rec.
adds $\dot{a} \pi \delta$ Өєо̂ $\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ каi Kupiov 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{u} \mathrm{X} \rho$. on strong external authority [AC (appy.) KL and DE omitting $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$; most mss. ; Fuld., Tol., Copt., Syr.-Phil. with asterisk), Eth. (Platt); Chrys. al. (Lachm. in brackets)]; the omission however is fairly supported [BFG: some mss.; Vulg., Syr., Ath., Arm. ; Chrys. (comm.), Theoph., al. (Tisch.)], and on critical grounds is decidedly preferable, as the uniqueness of the form in St Paul's Epp. would be likely to suggest interpolation; comp. Col. i. 2.
2. EvंXарเбтоû $\mu \mathrm{ev}$ ]'We give thanks;' see note on Phil. i. 3, and add 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13. It has been doubted whether the plural is to be understood of the Apostle alone (Koch, Conyb.), as in ch. ii. I8, iii. I sq., or to be referred also to Silvanus and Timothy; contrast Phil. i. I, 3. As the plural is elsewhere used in reference to the Apostle and his $\sigma u v e \rho \gamma o i$ (comp. 2 Cor. i. 19, and notes on Cul. i. 3), and as Silvanus and Timuthy stood in a very close relation to the Church of Thessalonica, it seems most natural here to adopt the latter view ; so Lünem., and Alford, who however appears inexact in claiming all the ancient commentt., as Chrys. and the Greek expositors seem clearly, tbough indirectly, to adopt the former view. On the late use of the verb ev́xapt$\sigma \tau \epsilon i \nu$ in the sense of 'gratias agere,' see notes on Phil. i. 3, and esp. on Col.
 occurs in I Tim. i. 12, 2 Tim. i. 3, and as an alternative reading in Philem. 7 (Tisch.). These thanks are returned to God (the Father, comp.
 $\pi \hat{a} v$, Chrys. : so 2 Thess. i. 3,2 Tim.
i. 3 , and, with the addition of $\mu \circ v$, Rom. i. 8, I Cor. i. 4, Phil. i. 3, Philem. 4. та́итотє к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. here obviously belongs to the finite verb (ı Cor. i. 4, 2 Thess. i. 3, comp. Eph. i. 16), not to the participle (Phil. i. 4, Col. i. 3, Philem. 4). Even if the second $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ be omitted (see below), the connexion with the participle will be almost equally untenable, as the expression $\mu \nu \epsilon i \alpha \nu \pi o t \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \theta \alpha \iota$ $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ rivos, though not unclassical (Plato, Protag. p. 3 г 7 E), is not elsewhere found in St Paul's Epp.; so Syr., Ath., the Greek expositors (silet Theod.), and nearly all modern editors. On the alliteration тáyrore $\pi \epsilon \rho l \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$, comp. notes on Phil. i. 4. $\quad \pi \epsilon \rho$ т $\pi$ 人́vт $\omega \nu$ í $\mu \omega \nu]$ ' concerning you all;' not without slight emphasis and affectionate cumulation; the Church of Thessalonica, like that of Philippi, presented but few unfavourable developments. The very eúXapıorla was tacitly commendatory

 the inclusive nature of it still more expressly so. The difference between the use of $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ( 1 Cor. i. 4, $d e c$.) and $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ (Rom. i. 8, \&ec.) in this and similar formulæ in the N.T. is scarcely appreciable ; see notes on $E p h$. vi. I9. Perhaps, as a general rule, we may say that in the former the attention is more directed to the object or circumstances to which the action of the verb extends, in the latter more to that action itself; see notes on Gal. i. 4 , and Phil. i. 7.
$\mu v e l a v \dot{u} \mu \hat{\omega} v \pi o t o u ́ \mu$.] 'making mention of you;' not a limitation of the preceding $\epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi a \rho$. тávтotє, but a definition of the circumstances under which it took place; see Rom. i. 9, Eph. i. 16, Philem. 4, and comp. Phil.
i. 3, 4, 2 Tim. i. 3. For further remarks on the formula (not 'making mention of or remembering,' Jowett, but simply the former,-as often in Aristotle, al.), see notes on Philem. 4, and for a distinction between $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$ ( $\gamma \epsilon \nu / \kappa \grave{\eta} \tau v ́ \pi \omega \sigma \iota s \quad \psi \nu \chi \hat{\eta} s$ ) and $\mu \nu \in i a$
 monius, Voc. Diff. p. 95 (ed. Valck.). Mecla has the meaning 'commemoratio' only when it is joined with тoteígAal, see notes on Phil. i. 3. The reading is doubtful ; Lachm. omits $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ after $\mu \nu \epsilon l a \nu$ with $A B \mathbf{N}^{1}$; Vulg. (Amiat.), $\mathbf{C}$ omits $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ (I) ; see crit. note on Eph. i. i6. It does not however seem improbable that the presence of the former $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ suggested a supposed emendatory omission.
 prayers,' 'in orationibusnostris,' Vulg., Copt. (comp. Syr., Ath.), -not merely ' at the time I offer them,' but, with a tinge of local reference, 'in my performance of that duty;' see Bernhardy, Synt. v. 23 a, p. 246, and notes on $E p h$. i. 16. In such cases the fundamental meaning of the prep. may just be traced in the way in which it marks the object to which the action has reference, its point, so to say, of application; see Krüger, Sprachl.§ 68. 40. 5 .
 used in the N. T. only by St Paul, ch. ii. 13, v. 17 , Rom. i. 9, and in all cases in direct (ch. v. I7) or indirect connexion with prayer or thanksgiving. The adverb is referred by Vulg., Syr., Ath., Arm., and some modern expositors, to the preceding participle, but far more naturally by Chrys. and the Greek commentators to $\mu \nu \eta \mu \rho \nu \varepsilon v^{\prime}$ oy hance and expand what had preceded; so Lachm., Tisch., Buttm., and per-
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haps Copt., Vulg. (Amiat.). Alford connects it with $\pi 0, o u \mu$. urging Rom. $\mathbf{i}$. 9 , but there the order is different. $\mu \nu \eta \mu \mathbf{v \epsilon} \mathbf{v}^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \epsilon s$ ' remembering,' Auth., 'memores,' Vulg., Clarom. ; participial clause parallel to the preceding
 the cause (Schott) but the circumstances and temporal concomitants of the action: the eixapertla found its utterance in the prayers, and owed its persistence ( $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau 0 \tau \epsilon$ ) to the unceasing continuance of the $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$. The first participle has thus more of a modal, the second of a temporal tinge; ov

 тoтє, Theoph. It has been doubted whether $\mu \nu \eta \mu \nu \nu$. is here 'commemorare' (Beza), or 'memor [esse '] (Vulg., Syr., Eth., Arm., and appy. Copt.) as in Heb. xi. 22 (but with $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ and a gen.). The context ( $\xi \mu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \quad \Theta \epsilon 00$ к.т.ג.) seems to be slightly in favour of the former ( De Wette), but St Paul's use of the verb, and the case which follows it (gen, not accus.), are somewhat decidedly in favour of the latter; see ch. ii. 9, Winer, Gr. § 30 . 10, p. 184, Jelf, Gr. § 515 , obs., and notes on 2 Tim. ii. 8 . The tbree objects of the Apostle's remembrance then follow in their natural order (so ch. v. 8, Col. i. 4, comp. Tit. ii. 2; aliter I Cor. xiii. I3), $\operatorname{a}^{2} \boldsymbol{q}^{\prime} \pi \eta$ being the result and exemplification of $\pi / \sigma \tau \iota s$, and $\epsilon \lambda \pi \iota s$ the link between the prosent and the future; comp. also i Pet. i. 21, 22, and see Reuss, Théol. Chrét. iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 219, and esp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. I. 4, p. 238.
 faith,' i.e. 'which characterizes, is the distinctive feature of faith ;' comp. How. ii. 15 , and in point of sentiment

$\mu$ én. The precise meaning and connexion of these words has been much contested. The simplest view seems to be as followe: ( I ) ' $\Upsilon \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is not immediately dependent on $\mu \nu \eta \mu o \nu$. (Ccum.), as this would involve an untenable ellipse of a prep. before the succeeding words (see Herm. Viger, p. 701, Lond. 1824), but is a possess. gen. in connexion with $\tau o \hat{e}$ tpyov, and also (as its slightly emphatic position suggests) with $\tau 0 \hat{v} \kappa \delta \pi o u$ and $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{v} \pi \sigma-$

 is certainly not pleonastic, but must stand in parallelism both in force and meaning (hence not 'veritas,' Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 332) with the succeeding tô кбтои (Winer, Gr. §65.7, p. 541), and has probably here not so muchacollective(Syr. $\left.\right|_{?} ^{n} \stackrel{\circ}{n}$ (opera]), as a tinge of active force, imparted both by tbe context and the following тои̂ кбтои; comp. Eph. iv. in, Knapp, Scripta Var. Arg. Vol. II. p. 49 r note, and Usteri, Lehrb. II. I. 4, p. 23 . (3) Tins $\pi$ l $\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ is certainly not a gen. of apposition (Alf.), as it would thus lose all parallelism with the succeeding genitives, but is either (a) a gen. of the origin (Hartung, Casus, p. 17, comp. notes on Col. i. 23), 'quod ex fide proficiscitur,' Grot., or perhaps more simply (b) a possessive genitive, toû Eprou being the prevailing feature and characteristic of the $\pi / \sigma \tau / s$, and that by which it evinces its vitality ; comp.
 rat, who however, with Theod., al., limits $\tau \delta \notin \gamma o \nu$ to endurance in suffer-
 a very doubtful restriction.
 love,' i.e. (retaining the same genitival relation as in the preceding words)
 'Iŋ
'the toil which characterizes and evinces the vitality of love;' ' multum est per se dilectio, sed multo magis si accedunt molesti labores, id enim к $\delta$ $\pi$ os,' Grot.; see notes on I Tim. iv. ıo. The $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$ is here not in reference to God, or to God and one another (comp. ©cum.), but simply to the latter (Col. i. 4, Heb. vi. ro) ; and that as evinced,-not merely in teaching (comp. De W.) or in bearing a brother's faults (Theod.) or in ministering to the sick, dc. (Alf.)-but, as the forcible $\kappa \delta \pi$ os seems to suggest, in ministering to, labouring for, and if need be suffering for, a brother-Christian; comp. Chrys. in loc. On the theological meaning and application of díain (Vulg. 'caritas' [ 89 times] or 'dilectio ' [24 times] but never ' amor,' consider however August. de Civ. Dei, xiv. 'r), see Reuss, Théol Chrét. iv. 19, Vol. If. p. 203 sq., and conip. Barrow, Serm. xxyii. Vol. II. p. 44 sq.
 Hope,' i.e. as before, the patience which is not exactly the product ( $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{e}}$ W.) or the cause (Ecum.), but the distinguishing and characterizing fea-


 $\sigma \kappa v \theta \rho \omega \pi \alpha$, Theod. In the noble word $\dot{v} \pi о \mu \circ \nu \dot{\eta}$, there always appears in the N. T. a background of ävopila (comp. Plato, Theat. p. ${ }_{77} \mathrm{~B}$, where $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \iota \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$
 it does not mark merely the endurance, the 'sustinentia' (Vulg., but here only), or even the 'patientia' (Clarom. here, and Vulg. generaliy), but the 'perseverantia' (see Cicero, de Invent. iI. 54. 163), the brave patience with which the Christian contends against the various hindrances, persecutions
(Chrys.), and temptations (Theoph.), that befall him in his conflict with the inward and outward world; comp. Rev. ii. 3, and see notes on 2 Tim. ii. ro, Trench, Synon. Part. II. § 3, and Neander, Planting, Vol. i. p. 479 (Bohn). In some cases it seems almost to occupy the place of $\epsilon \lambda \pi i s$, as it stands in conjunction with $\pi i \sigma \tau i s$ and áqám $\eta$ in 1 Tim. vi. If, Tit. ii. 2, and with $\pi i \sigma \pi / s$ in 2 Thess. i. 4 : for a full notice of other shades of meaning, comp. Barrow, Serm. xlit. Vol. II. p. 525 sq. toû Kuplou к.t.入. does not refer to the three preceding substantives (Olsh.), but merely to the immediately foregoing $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \pi i \delta o s$ : our Lord was the object of that hope; His second coming was that to which it ever turned its gaze; comp. ver ro, and see Reuss, Théol. Chrét. iv. 2o, Vol. II. p. 221. For exx. of similar accumulation of genitives, esp. in St Paul's Epp., see Winer, Gr. § 30. 3.
 'before God and our Father,' scil.

 к.т.入. (Theod., Theoph. 2, Jowett), as in such a case the article could scarcely be dispensed with. "E $\mu \pi \rho \circ \tau \theta \epsilon \nu$ is joined expressly with $\tau 0 \hat{\theta} \Theta \epsilon \hat{v}$ only in this Ep. (ch. iii. 9, I3, comp. ii. 19) and in Acts x. 4 (not Rec.); but the phrase is scarcely distinguishable in meaning from the more usual $\overline{\epsilon \nu \dot{\omega} \pi t o \nu}$ $\tau \circ u ̈$ Ө., Rom. xiv. 22, Gal. i. 20, al., or the less usual द̀ yaurı $\tau 0 \hat{0}$ Ө., Luke i. 8, Acts viii. 2 ( not Rec.) : it serves to hint at the more solemr circumstances (of prayer) under which the remembrance took place, and to mark its sincerity and earnestness; it was no accidental or pretended $\mu \nu$ cia, but one entertained in His presence, and in which His


eyes saw no insincerity; comp. Calv. in loc., and on the phrase generally, Frankel. Vorstud. z. LXX. p. 159. On the formula $\dot{j} \theta \epsilon \delta s$ кai $\pi a \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$, see notes on Gal. i. 4, and on the most suitable translation, notes to Transl. in loc.
4. €i\&ótes] 'seeing we know,' or
 [novimus enim] Syr.; participial clause parallel to $\mu \nu \eta \mu \circ \nu \epsilon$ viovics, and similarly dependent on eixapiotồ $\mu \in \nu$, serving to explain the reasons and motives which led to the evizapiotia. The finite verb has thus three participial clauses attached to it; the first serves principally to define the manner, the second the time and circumstances, the third the reason and motive of the action. These delicate uses of the Greek participle deserve particular attention; comp. Kriiger, Sprachl. § 56. 1o sq. See also Phil. i. 3, 4, 5, and notes on ver. 5. It is somewhat singular that so good a commentator as Theodoret should refer eibóres to the Thessalonians; so also Grot., who connects the clause with the remote
 of such a connexion in any of the ancient Vr. except 不th. Pol.
 God;' comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13 ; so rightly Syr., Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Ath.Pol., and inferentially Chrys. (in $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$
 $\tau(s \pi a \dot{a} \sigma \chi 01)$. To connect ind $\theta \epsilon o \hat{u}$ with
 and our own Auth., involves a disturbance of the natural order, and an ellipse of $\epsilon i v a c$ that is here highly improbable. The article is inserted before $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ by ACKN ; io mss.
 scil. out of others not $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa$ rol, with
reference to the sovereign decree of God made before the foundation of the world; see Eph. i. 4, and notes in loc. To refer this merely to the manner of their election to the Gospel (Baumg.Crus., Jowett 2), or to any internal renewing of the Spirit (Pelt), is in a high degree forced and unsatisfactory. On the use of the terms $\xi \kappa \lambda \xi \xi a \sigma \theta a l$, $\epsilon_{\kappa} \lambda o \gamma \eta^{\prime}$, and $\epsilon_{\kappa} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \delta s$, in St Pauil's Epp. see Reuss, Théol. Chrét. Iv. $1_{4}$, Vol. 11. p. 132, and on the doctrine generally, the clear and in the main satisfactory statements of Ebrard, Dogmatik, § 560 , 56r; comp. also the very valuable remarks of Hooker, on Predest. Vol. II. p. 705 sq. (ed. Keble), especially pp. $711,712$.
 Syr., 'quia,' Vulg. (not perfectly conclusive), and sim. Copt., Æth., Arm.: reason for this knowledge on the part of St Paul and his companions, öct having here its causal force (Winer, Gr. § 53. 8. b, p. 395), and, with its regular objective characteristics (Krüger, Sprachl. § 65 . 8. 1), referring to known facts as confirmatory of a preceding assertion. The Apostle argues they must be elect, first because (ver. 5) he and his companions were enabled to preach the Gospel amoing them with such power, and secondly (ver. 6) because they received it with such joy; Éк $\quad$ тoútou

 Theoph. Others, as Bengel and Schott, give $\begin{aligned} & \text { ot } \iota ~ i t s ~ e x p o s i l o r y ~ f o r c e, ~ ' t h a t, ' ~\end{aligned}$ 'to wit that' (see Krüger, Sprachl. § 6r. I. 3), and place only a comma after $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$; in which case ver. 5 becomes an objective sentence (Donalds. $G r . \S 58_{4}$ sq.) dependent on $\epsilon i \dot{\partial} \tau \epsilon \varsigma$,
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and more distinctly explanatory of the nature of the $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda 0 \gamma \dot{\eta}$. This is grammatically tenable, but certainly not exegetically satisfactory, as the whole context seems to have more of a direct and argumentative, than of a dependent and explanatory nature.
 Gospel which we preached;' the gen. being appy. that of the mediate source or origin (Hartung, Casus, p. 23), or perhaps rather of the mediate causa efficiens; see notes on ver. 6.
 you;' not ' erga vos,' Calv., but simply 'ad vos,' Vulg., Copt., the preposition not having here its ethical force foomp. Philem. 6), but simply marking the direction which was taken by the évar $\gamma^{\ell \lambda} \iota_{\iota \nu}$; comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § I70, and notes on Gal. iii. 14 . The reading is perhapsdoubtful. II $\rho$ dे $\dot{v} \mu a ̂ s$ is well supported, viz. by $\mathrm{AC}^{2} \mathrm{D}$ EFG; 5 mss.; Chrys., Theoph. (Lachm.). As however els appears a less probable correction for $\pi \rho \delta$ s than the converse, and is supported by strong external authority [ ${ }^{B}$ (perhaps $\mathrm{C}^{1}$ ) KLN; nearly all mss. ; Chrys. (ms.), Theod., al., Griesb., Tisch.], we retain the reading of Rec. If $\pi \rho \partial{ }^{\text {s }}$ be adopted, the same meaning will be admissible (comp. 2 John 12, not Rec.), but will seem less probable than 'apud' (Clarom. ; comp. I Cor. xvi. ro), as the general reference of the context is rather to the development of the Gospel among them than the circumstances of its first arrival; for this meaning of $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ mpds (denoting continuance) in the N.T., which Alford seems to doubt, see Meyer on I Cor. ii. 3, and Fritz. on Mark, p. 201.

On the passive form ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \theta \eta$, which occurs noticeably often in this and the
following chapter ( 8 times, against I $_{7}$ in the rest of the N.T. of which 5 are quotations from the LXX.), but appy. does not involve any passive meaning (Alf.), see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 108, Thomas M. p. 189 (ed. Bern.), and notes on Col. iv. II.
iv $\lambda \delta$ 'үч] ' in word;' not merely equivalent to $\lambda \delta \gamma^{\prime}$ s (comp. Jowett), but, as usual, with a reference to the sphere or domain of its action; ' non stetit intra verba,' Grot. ; compare Winer, Gr. § 48. a. 3. a, p. 345.
Ev Suvápel к.т.ג.] 'in power and in the Holy Ghost;' 'in the element of power and-to specify a yet higher principle ( $\kappa a l$ being not so much explanatory as slightly climactic, see notes on ver. 6)-in the influence of the Holy Ghost ; the preposition as before defining the sphere, and thence inferentially the manner, in which the preaching took place; see notes on
 refer specially to 'miraculous powers' (Theod., Theoph., al.), but, as in the similar passage 1 Cor. ii. 4 , to the reality, energy, and effective earnestness, with which the Apostle and his followers preached among the Thessalonians. Jowett defends the reference of $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \delta \nu$. to the influence produced on the Thess., but is thus led into an interpr. of $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \Pi \varepsilon \in \dot{\mu} \mu$. $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\ell} \varphi,-$ 'the inspiration of the speaker caught by the hearers,' which, as tending to obscure the reference to the personal $\Pi v e \hat{v} \mu a a^{\prime} \gamma t o v$, seems in a high degree precarious and unsatisfactory. On the use of IIvê̂ma as a proper name, see notes on Gal. v. 5, and comp. Winer, Gr. § ig. r, p. ini.
 surance,' i.e. 'much confidence, much assured persuasion,' on the part of the

## 

preachers; subjective, corresponding to the more objective side presented in the preceding clause: comp. Heb. x. 22, $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi \circ \rho l q \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$, which latter subst. Alford here unnecessarily inserts in translation. Of the three explanations which Jowett proposes, (a) certainty, (b) fulness of spiritual gifts, Corn. a Lap., al., (c) effect, fulfilment, Thom. Aq. 2 , the first alone seems in harmony with the context, if limited to the Apostle and bis companions. To refer it to the Thessalonians (Musc., comp. Zanch. ap. Pol. Syn.), or to them and the Apostle (Vorst., Schott), seems to mar the correct sequence of thought, and to introduce notices of the state of the recipients which come first into view in ver. 6. The word $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o-$ фopla (Hesych. $\beta \in \beta a, \sigma \tau \eta s$ ) appears to be confined to the N. T. (Col. ii. 2, Heb. vi. II, x. 22) and the ecclesiastical writers. The $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$ before $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi$. is omitted by BN ; some mss.
 ' appeal for confirmation to the knowledge of the readers themselves,' Olsh.;
 $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$, Theoph. To place a colon or period at $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta}$, and regard $\kappa a \theta \dot{\omega} s$ ot $\delta \alpha \pi \epsilon$ as the antecedent member of a sentence of which кal $\dot{v} \mu \mathrm{i} i \mathrm{~s}$ is the consequent ('qualem me vidistis . . . tales etiam vos estis,' Koppe), involves untenable meanings of ot $\delta a \tau \epsilon$ and $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta$. $\theta \eta \tau \epsilon$, and is well refuted by Lünemann
 manner of men we proved;' not 'quales fuerimus,' Vulg., nor yet quite somuch as 'facti simus,' Alf. (who throws undue emphasis on the passive form), but, with the more certain and natural sense, 'caine to be, proved to be;' see notes above, and on Col. iv. ir. The $\pi$ robt $\eta$ s was not evinced merely in confronting dangers (Theod. comp.Chrys.),
but in the power and confidence with which they delivered their message. סı' ن́pâs] ' on your account,' ' for your sake;' 'propter vos,' Vulg. ; not with sо specific a force as $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ (comp. Theod., who uses this latter formula in connexion with кıvס́vous $\dot{v} \phi \varepsilon \sigma \tau a ́ v a t)$, nor yet one so undefined as $\pi \epsilon \rho i \dot{\psi} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, but with a clear and distinct reference to the cause and best interests [' sake,' -Sax. sac, Germ. Sache] of those to whom the Apostle preached ; $\tau \hat{\eta} s \epsilon \mu \hat{\eta} s$ [ $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho a s$ ] $\sigma \pi o u ́ \delta \eta s \tau \hat{\eta} s \epsilon l s \dot{\nu} \mu a ̂ s \dot{\eta} \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$
 (Ecum. The $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \dot{v} \mu i v$, it need scarcely be said, is simply 'among you;' àe$\sigma \tau \rho d \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu}$, Theoph. The $\begin{gathered}\text { t }\end{gathered}$ however is omitted by ACN ; 4 mss. ; Vulg. (Aniat.).
 yebecame imitators of us;' second ground for knowing that the Thess. were ${ }_{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau о$, -the $\kappa$ al not being ascensive (comp. notes on Eph. ii. 1, Phil.iv. 12) or equivalent to 'sic, more Hebræo' (Grot.), but simply copulative, and the verse remaining, if not structural'y, yet logically, under the vinculum of the preceding $8 \tau$. It thus seems best to place neither a period (Tischu., $A l f$.) nor a conma (Lachm., Buttm.), but a colon, after ver. 5. Here, as in ver. 5, Lünem. and Alf. lay a stress on the passive form $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \eta \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$. This however is lexically doubtful: the Apostle is rather dwelling on the effects produced among them, on wbat they came to be, and thus significantlyadopts not the simple verb $\mu \iota \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$, but the
 r Cor. iv. 16, xi. r, Eph. v. r, Phil. iii. 17. kal тoû Kuplov] 'and of the Lord,' all misunderstanding is prevented by means of the insertion of roû K. with the slightly climactic kal, see Hartung, Partik.
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каi, 5. 4, Vol. 1. p. I45. This use of the particle, which is strictly in accordance with its supposed derivation [tshi, 'cumulare,' comp. Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. 11. p. 320], forms the surt of connecting link between its simply copulative and simply ascensive uses, and may perlaps be termed its climactic use ; comp. Fritz. on Mark i. 5, p. II. For a brief analysis of the leading distinctions in the use of this particle, see notes on Phil. iv. 12 .
The exact manner in which the Thessalonians became imitators of their founders,--and of the Lord, is defined in the concluding words of the verse,
 joy amid suffering and affliction is the 'tertium comparationis;' comp. Acts v. 4 I , Heb. x. 34 -
$\delta_{\epsilon \xi} \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu \circ \iota$ тд̀ $\lambda$ óyov] 'having received the word;' temporal use of the participle (see notes on Eph.iv. 8), marking here the contemporaneousness of the action with that of the finite verb: the predication of manner is given in the following words; comp. Rom. iv. 20. It is scarcely necessary to add that $\tau \grave{\partial}$入ó ${ }^{\circ}$ ov is here practically equivalent to
 ( 2 Cor. ii. 17 ), or $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta_{\epsilon}$ las (Eph. i. 13), and refers to the preaching of the Gospel, which was the $\lambda$ 'o yos кat' $\bar{\xi} \xi 0$ $\chi$ म́v; comp. Luke viii. $\mathrm{I}_{3}$, Acts xvii. iI. On the force of $\delta \in \xi \bar{\xi} \sigma \theta a c$ tò $\nu$入óroy, and its probable distinction from $\pi a \rho a \lambda a \beta \varepsilon \hat{\nu} \tau$. $\lambda \dot{\partial} \gamma$., see notes on
 ' in much affiction.' The affliction of the Thessalonians dated back as early as their first reception of the Gospel (see Acts xvii. 6), and, as this Epistle incidentally shows, continued both while the Apostle was with them (ch. ii. 14), and after he had left then

## (ch. iii. 2, 3). <br> xapâs

Пиєv́patos áy.] 'joy of the Holy Spirit,' certainly not 'lætitiam de Spiritu,' Fritz. (Nova Opusc. p. 271), still less रapà $\pi \nu \epsilon \cup \mu a \tau \iota \kappa$ ' (Jowett), but 'joy inspired by and emanating from the Spirit:' gen. of the originating cause; see notes on Col. i. 23. Between the two usual forms of the gen. of 'ablation ' (see Donaldson, Gr. § 448, 449), viz. (a) the stronger gen. of the causa efficiens, and (c) the weaker gen. originis, which forms the point of transition to the partitive genitive, it is perhaps not hypereritical in the N.T. to insert (b) a gen. of the originating cause, or, if the expression be permissible, the originating agent,-in which the two ideas of source and agency are blended and intermixed; consider the exx. cited in Scheuerl. Synt. § 17. I, p. 126. With the present case, which appears to fall under (b),-the Spirit being not only an external giver, but an internal source of the xapd-contrast on the one hand 2
 where the verbal in - $\mu$ os suggests $(a)$, and on the other Gal. v. 22, $\cdot \dot{\delta} \kappa \alpha \rho \pi \delta s$ тô $\Pi_{\nu \in \dot{u} \mu}$., where, if the gen. be not possessive, the image seems to suggest the weaker (c). Such distinctions, which are not wholly without importance in the N.T., are really due as much to doctrinal as to grammatical considerations; comp. Winer, Gr. § 30 . I, p. 167 sq.
 became an ensample:' spiritual progress of the Thessalonian converts; they were not only imitators of the example of their teachers, but were themselves (regarded as a collective body ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 27. 1, p. 157 note) an example to others. This
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could hardly apply to those who had received the Gospel before them（oi $\pi \rho \circ \lambda a \beta b \nu \tau \epsilon$ ，Chrys．，Theoph．），for，as Lunemann observes，the church of Philippi was the only one in Europe which received the Gospel before that of Thessalonica；comp．ch．ii．2，Acts xvi ． 12 sq ．The reading is very doubt－ ful；the plural túnous（Rec．）is well supported［ACFGKLN；most mss．； Boern．，Syr．－Phil．；many Ff．］，but seems so much more likely to have been changed from the singular than vice versâ（Schott），that on the whole тúmov，though having less external authority $\left[\mathrm{BD}^{1}\left(\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}\right.\right.$ and I ms．read тúmos）； 7 mss．；Clarom．，Sangerm．， Vulg．，Syr．，屃th．（both），al．，Lachm． （non marg．），Tisch．］，is here to be pre－ ferred．$\quad \pi \hat{a} \sigma เ \nu$ тоîs $\pi เ \sigma \tau$ ．］
＇to all the believers；＇$\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$ vovol not having here a pure participial force， тois $\eta$ グ $\eta \eta \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} v a \sigma l$ ，Chrys．，but，as often in the N．T．，coalescing with the article to form a substantive；see Winer，Gr．§ 45．7，p． 316.
 donia and Achaia，＇i．e．the whole of Greece ；Acts xix．21，Rom．xv．26， comp． 2 Cor．ix．2．Macedonia was at first（b．c． $1^{167}$ ）divided by the Ro－ wans into four districts，but subse－ quently（B．c．I 4 2）reunited into one provisce comprising all the northern portion of Greece．Achaia proper was also united with Hellas and the rest of the Peloponnese（b．c． $\mathrm{I}^{2}$ ）in one province，and as the leading state at that time gave the name to the whole southern portion of Greece ；see Winer， $R W B$ ．Vol．1．p．16，and Vol．II．p． 44．The omission of $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ befure $\tau \hat{\eta}$＇A－ $\chi$ aid（Rec．）Las against it a！l the uncial MSS．except KL．

8．á ${ }^{\prime}$＇ $\mathbf{v} \mu \hat{\mu} v$ үáp］＇For from you：＂
proof and amplification of the pre－ ceding assertion．The preposition is here simply local（Alf．），－not ethical （＇vobis efficientibus，＇Storr；a very questionable paraphrase），nor both com－ bined（Schott），－and marks the Thes－ salonians as the simple terminus a quo of the $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \eta \chi \in \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a u$ ．It may be observed that appy．in all cases in the N．T． where $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{d}$ ，is said to be equivalent to $\dot{v} \pi d$ the action implied in the verb is represented as emanating from，rather than wrought by the assumed agent； comp．Luke vi． 88 （not Rec．），James i．13，see Winer，Gr．§ 47．b，p．331， and notes on Gal．i．I．
 $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$ ．$\lambda \epsilon \gamma 6 \mu$ ．in the N．T．（Hesychius， $\left.\epsilon \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\epsilon \nu} \cdot \epsilon \in \kappa \eta \rho \dot{\prime} \chi \theta \eta\right)$ ，but found in the LXX．（Joel iii．14，，Ecelus．xl．13） and occasionally in later writers，e．g． Polyb．Hist．xxx．4．7，тò кúкข $\frac{10 \nu}{}$ $\epsilon_{\xi}^{\xi} \eta \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ．The word forcibly marks both the clear and the pervasive na－
 $\sigma a ́ \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \gamma \circ s \quad \lambda a \mu \pi \rho \grave{̀} \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \chi о \dot{u} \sigma \eta s$ каl $\grave{\epsilon \pi i}$ $\pi 0 \lambda \dot{v} \phi \theta a \nu o i ́ \sigma \eta s$, Theoph．
ó $\lambda^{\prime}$ yos rô Kupiov］＇the word of the Lord，＇i．e．the Gospel（see above，ver．6） as received by the Thessalonians，not ＇the report that it was received by them＇（De W．），still less＇your bright example became itself a message from the Lord＇（Alf．），－both of which in－ terpretations seem needlessly artificial． The Gospel was received by them with such eager zeal，its words were so constantly in their mouths and so wrought in their hearts，that it swelled as it were into a mighty trumpet－call that was heard of all men sounding forth from Thessalonica．
© $v$ т sion of the article and prep．before ＇A $\chi$ ait is not only permissible（on the

##  

ground that the previous more exact specification of each would preclude any misconception), but really grammatically exact: Macedonia and Achaia now form a whole in antithesis to the rest of the world ; comp. Winer, Gr. § i9. 4, p. $1 \mathbf{1 6}$ sq. The reading however is very doubtful: Lachm. inserts $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ with the strongest external testimony [CDEFGKLN; 30 mss ; Vulg., Clarom., Syr. (both), al.], but as the insertion of the $\varepsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ would seem so much more likely to have been a conformation to ver. 7, than its omission to have been accidental, we retain the reading of Rec., Tisch., though only with $B$; majority of mss.; some Vv.; Chrys., Theod., al. In A there is a lacuna (ver. 8 beginning with $\left.a \lambda \lambda^{\prime} z^{2} \nu \pi a \nu \tau i\right)$ arising from Ho mœoteleuton. $\quad \mathbf{d} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} v \pi a v t!$ к.т. $\lambda$.$] There is some little difficulty in$ the exact connexion, as $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \bar{\epsilon} \nu \quad$ к. $. \lambda . \lambda$. seems clearly to stand in immediate antithesis to ou $\mu b \nu o \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. (opp. to Lünem, who places a colon after Kvplov), but yet atands associated with a new nominative. The most simple explanation is that of Rückert (Loc. Paul. Expl. Jen. 1844), according to which the Apostle is led by the desire of making a forcible climax into a disregard of the preceding nominative, and in fact puts a sentence in antithesis to ov $\mu{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu o \nu-A \chi a i ̆ q$, instead of the simple local clause $\bar{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{y} \pi a v \tau i \tau \delta \pi \varphi$ or $\epsilon^{\dot{\epsilon}} \nu{ }^{\circ} \lambda \lambda \psi \tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa b \sigma \mu \varphi$ (Rom. i. 8) which the strict logical connexion actually required.

Rec. inserts кal after $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda a ́$, but on decidedly insufficient authority-viz. D3EKL; Vulg. (not Amiat.), and several Ff. On the distinction between this latter form (' ubi prior notio non per se sed quatenus sola est negatur') and oú $\mu \delta \nu 0 \nu \ldots \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{a}$
('ubi posterior notio ut gravior in locum prioris substituitur priore non plane sublato '), see the good note of Kühner on Xen. Mem. 1. 6. 2, and correct accordingly Jelf, Gr. § 762 . I; see also Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 8.
ทั $\pi$ Tpòs tòv Eєóv] 'which is toward God,' 'to God-ward,' Auth. : more exact definition of the miotcs by means of the repeated article; comp. Tit. ii. ro, notes on Gal. iii. 26, and Winer, $G r . \S 20$. г, p. 1 19 sq. The less usual preposition $\pi \rho \delta s$ is here used with great propriety, as there is a tacit contrast to a previous faith $\pi \rho \delta s{ }^{\tau} \mathrm{d}$ el $\delta \omega \lambda a$ (see ver. 9), in which latter case the deeper $\pi l \sigma \pi$. $\epsilon$ is (faith to and into,-surely not 'on,' Alf.) would seem to be theologically unsuitable. On the meaning of $\pi l \sigma \tau$. $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} s$, see notes on Philem. 5, and on the force of $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ and $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ with different prepp., Reuss, Théol. Chrêt. Iv. I4, Vol. II. p. 129, and notes on 1 Tim. i. 16.
 forth :' so, with reference to a report, Matth. ix. 26, Mark i. 28, Rom. x. 18 (Ps. xix. 5) ; Koch compares the $\mathrm{He}-$
 LXX. The currency of the report was probably much promoted by the commercial intercourse between Thessalonica and other cities, both in Greece and elsewhere; see Koch in loc., and Wieseler, Chronol. p. 42, who suggests that Aquila and Priscilla, who had lately come from Rome to Corinth (Acts xviii. 2), might have mentioned to the Apostle the prevalence of the report even in that more distant city. If this be so, the justice and truth of the Apostle's liyperbole is still more apparent ; to be known in Rome was to be known everywhere: contrast Baur, Paulus, p. 484 . Rec.



adopts the order $\dot{\eta} \mu$ as ${ }^{\prime} \chi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, but only with KL ; most mss.
$\lambda_{a} \lambda_{\epsilon} \uparrow \tau \tau 1$ ]'to speal anything,'sc. about your $\pi l \sigma \pi \iota$, or as Syr. $\underset{\nabla}{\text { S. }}$ [de vobis]; $\pi \rho o u ̈ \lambda a \beta \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ \dot{\eta} \phi^{r} \mu \eta$
 $\lambda о \mu \epsilon \nu$, Theod. On the difference between $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ and $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$, comp. notes on Tit. ii. ı; and see Trench, Synon. Part 11. § 26. The fundamental distinction that $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} p$ (Hesych. $\phi \theta \theta^{\prime} \gamma-$ $\gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a i)$ points merely to sound and utterance, $\lambda \epsilon$ ¢ $\epsilon \omega \nu$ to purport, is mainly observed in the N.T. with the exception that $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon i v$ is sometimes used where $\lambda \in \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ would appear more natural, but never vice versata ; see esp. the good note of Lücke on John viii. 43.
9. avtoi'] 'they themselves;' i.e. the people in Macedonia and Achaia and elsewhere; a very intelligible 'constructio ad sensum;' see Winer, Gr. § 22. 3, p. 131, and notes on Gal. ii. 2. The interpr. of Pelt, 'sponte,' aito$\mu a \theta \hat{\omega}$ s, is here artificial and unnecessary: aúrol stands in somewhat emphatic antithesis to the preceding $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{âs}$; ' we have no need to say anything about you, for they to whom otherwise we might have told it themselves speak of it and spread it;' ó $\pi \alpha \rho a \mu \xi$ -
 $\pi a \rho \partial \nu \tau a s$ каl: $\tau \in \theta \epsilon a \mu \notin \nu$ ous $\tau$ à $\dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \in \tau \epsilon \rho a$
 $\theta \in a \mu \notin \nu o l \pi$ тарала $\mu \beta a ́ v o v \sigma_{\imath} \nu$, Chrys. $\pi \epsilon \mathrm{p} i \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} v$ ] ' about us,' scil. the Apostle and his helpers; not 'de me et vobis simul,' Zanch. (compare Lünem.,well answered by Alf.), as the studied prominence of $\pi \in \rho l \dot{\eta} \dot{\mu} \hat{\omega} \nu$ and the real point of the clause are thus completely overlooked: instead of our telling
about our own success, they do it for us; â $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ aùroùs é $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \quad \pi a \rho{ }^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} v$
 roval, Chrys. $\quad$ отоlav к.т.入.] 'what manner of entering in we had unto you:' fuller explanation of the preceding $\pi \epsilon \rho l \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$. The reference of the qualitative ojrolav ta the dangers and sufferings undergone by St Paul and his followers in their first preaching at Thessalonica (Chrys., Theoph., (Ecum.) is rightly rejected by most modern commentators: the $\pi o t i \tau \eta$ s is rather evinced in the power and confidence with which they preached, and serves to illustrate verse 5 .
Etrodos has here no ethical meaning, 'indolem nostram ' (Æth.-Pol. ; comp. Olsh.), but, as always in the N.T. (ch. ii. I, Acts xiii. 24, Heb. x. 19, 2 Pet. i. ir), is simply local in its reference, 'introitus,' Vulg., Arm., 'ingressus,' Copt., 'quomodo venimus ad vos,' Ath. (Platt) : so too inferentially the Greek commentators, and after them most modern writers. The present t $\boldsymbol{t}_{\chi o \mu \varepsilon \nu}$ (Rec.) appy. rests only on the authority of cursive mss., and is rejected by all modern editors.
 illustration of ver. 6 . The $\pi \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ does not necessarily involve $\epsilon \dot{\operatorname{v} \kappa} \delta \lambda \omega \rho, \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{d}$
 facilitate,' Calv., bat simply points to the fact of $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi^{\prime}$ (Alf.), the clause being not modal but objective; comp. Donalds. Gr. § 584. In the verb $\epsilon \pi \iota-$ $\sigma r \rho \in \phi \in \epsilon \nu$ the prep. does not here seem to mark regression (comp. notes on Gal. iv. 2), but simply direction : both meanings are lexically admissible (see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. and s. v. $\epsilon \pi i$, c), but the second seems to be most



in accordance with the context． mpòs $\tau \dot{\partial} v$ ©còv］marks the conversion in its general rather than its specifically Christian aspects，with reference to the former heathen and Gentile condi－ tion of the Thessalonians：if they had been Jews，the appropriate formula， as Olsh．well observes，would have been $\pi \rho \dot{\delta} s \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \mathrm{~K} u ́ \rho \iota \sigma \nu$ ．On this and the following verse，see a sound ser－ mon by Sherlock，Serm．LIII．Vol．III． p． 56 （ed．Hughes）．Sov入є́́єıv к． $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．］＇to serve the living and true God；＇infinitive of the purpose or in－ tention，єis tò $\delta o u \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda ., ~ C h r y s ., ~$ －a form of the final sentence（Donalds． Gr．§ 606）not uncommon in St Paul＇s Epp．；see I Cor．i．i7，Eph．i．4，Col． i．22．On the difference between this and the infin．with $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$（consecutive sentence），see notes on Col．l．c．，and comp．Winer，Gr．§ 44. I，p． $28_{4}$ ，ed． 6 ，but more fully in $\S 45.3$ ，ed． 5 ． God has here the appropriate title of $\zeta \omega \nu$（Acts xiv． 15 ）in contrast with the dead（Wisdom xiv．5，29，comp． Habak．ii．19）and practically non－ existent（1 Cor．viii．4，see Meyer in loc．）gods of the heathen，and that of á $\lambda \eta \theta \iota \nu o ̀ s$（John xvii．3，I John v． 20，comp． 2 Chron．xv．3）in contrast to their false semblance（Gal．iv．8） and $\mu a \tau a \iota o ́ \tau \eta s$（hence 4，xxvi．i）．On the omission of the art．with $\Theta \epsilon$ ós，comp．Winer，Gr．§ 19 ． I，p．IIo．

10．avapéveเv］＇to await；＇second great purpose involved in the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho o-$ $\phi \eta^{\prime}:$ hope of the nature here described， as Lünem．observes，involves and in－ cludes faith，and forms a suitable pre－ paration for the allusions in the latter portion of the Epistle．If $\chi a \rho \dot{a}$ be said
to be the key－note of the Ep．to the Philippians（iii．I），$\epsilon \lambda \pi i s$ may truly be termed that of the present Ep．The verb $\dot{a}^{\prime} \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon L \nu, a \ddot{\alpha} \pi$ ．$\lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{o} \mu$ ．in the N．T．，does not here involve any re－ ference to a waiting one who is to return （comp．Beng．），nor yet any specific notion of eagerness or joy（Flatt），but simply that of patience（＇erharren，＇ Winer）and confidence ；the ávà having that modified intensive force（ $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \mu \epsilon$－ $\nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，Theod．，see I Tim．i． 3 ；$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \epsilon ́-$ $\nu \epsilon \iota$ ，Theoph．，see Acts i．4），which is so hard to convey without paraphrase ； see esp．Winer，de Verb．Comp．Ill． p．I5，and comp．Rost u．Palm，Lex． s．v．àvá，x．b．Êк ти̂v oưpav̂̂v belongs to á $\boldsymbol{a}^{\mu} \mu^{\prime} \nu \in \iota \nu$ ，involving a slight but perfectly intelligible form of bra－
 comp．Winer，Gr．§ 66．2，p． 547. ôv グүєьрєv к．т．入．］＇whom he raised from the dead：＇relativesentence placed emphatically before＇I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ v$ as involv－ ing an＇argumentum palmarium＇ （Beng．）of His sonship；see Rom．i．4， and comp．Pearson，Crced，Art．v．Vol． I．p． $3^{13}$（ed．Burton）．The article before $\nu \in \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ is omitted by Rec，with ACK；Ec．，but is supported by pre－ ponderating external evidence［BDE FGLN；Ff．］，and by the probability of a conformation to the more usual
 к．т．$\lambda$.$] ＇Jesus who delivereth us．＇The$ present participle has not the force of an aor．（＇qui eripuit，＇Vulg．，Arm．）or future part．（＇qui eripiet，＇Clarom．， ＇qui liberabit，＇Copt．），but may serve （a）to mark the action as commenced and continuing（Vorst．，Beng．＇Cbris－ tus nos semel $\epsilon \lambda v \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma a \tau o, ~ s e m p e r$ $\dot{\rho} \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \tau a l$＇），or（b）as＇rem certo futuram＇

Our coming among you was not vain；we nei－ ther beguiled you nor were burdensome，but toiled bravely，and en－ couraged you both by actions and words．

Aùтoì $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ oí $\delta a \tau \epsilon$, àd $\delta \lambda \phi o i ́, ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ II．


（Schott），or still more probably（c）is associated with the article in a sub－ stantival character，＇our deliverer，＇ Alf，；see Winer，Gr．§45．7，p． $3{ }^{16}$ ． dimò $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\mathrm{\eta}} \mathrm{~s}$ ópyท̂s］This powerful word （ $\delta \rho \gamma \eta$ ）is not merely synonymous with ко́入aбıs or т тцшріа（Orig．Cels．IV．p． 2 II；comp．Lünem．），but implies de－ finitely the holy anger of God against sin，－that anger which，when deeply considered，only serves to evince His love；see esp．Müller，Doctr．of Sin， 1．2，2，Vol．1．p． 265 （Clark）．For

 coming；more specific definition of the $\delta \rho \gamma \dot{\eta} ; \epsilon \hat{i} \pi \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{d} \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu, \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon$ $\kappa a i ̀ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ áv $\tau a \pi \delta \delta \sigma \sigma \iota \nu, \ddot{\eta}^{\nu} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a \nu \delta \rho \gamma \tilde{\eta} s$ $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{i}$ ，Ecum．The present participle has no future tinge，e．g．$=\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \eta$ s （Olsh．，Koch），but marks the certainty of the coming（Bernhardy，Synt．x．2， p． 371 ），and hints at the enduring pinciples of the moral government of God ；comp．Eph．v．5，Col．iii． 6.

Chapter II．I．Aúrol ydp oldate］ ＇For ye yourselves know；＇explanatory confirmation of the first part of ch．$i$ ． 9 ，by an appeal to the knowledge and experience of his readers．In ch．i． 9 two distinct subjects are alluded to， （a）the power and confidence of the preachers，（b）the obedience and recep－ tivity of the hearers，comp．Chrys．： the former is amplified in the present and II following verses，the latter in ver．13－16．Гà $\rho$ is thus certainly not resumptive，nor yet explicative，but wbat Hartung（Partik．$\gamma$ á $\rho, \S 2$ ）terms ＇argumentativ－exphcativ，＇the ápaele－ ment of the particle referring to what had preceded（＇quasi pro re nat̂̂ jam
recte atque ordine hoc ita se habere dicitur，＇Klotz），the $\gamma \dot{\epsilon}$ element add－ ing an explanatory asseveration；see esp．Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p．235．If the distinction of Hand（Tursell．Vol． II．p．375）be correct，＇nam ipsi，＇ Vulg．，is here a judicious correction of＇ipsi enim，＇Clarom．
 empty，＇i．e．void of power and earnest－ ness；＇non inanis，sed plena virtutis，＇ Beng．In this form of the objective sentence－by no means uncommon after verbs of＇knowledge，perception， $\& \in$. ．－there is an idiomatic anticipation of the object，which serves to awaken the reader＇s attention to the subsequent predications；see esp．Kruger，Sprachl． § 6r．6．2．For other forms of the objective sentence，see Donalds．Gr． §592．The exact meaning of $\kappa \epsilon \nu \grave{\eta}$ bas been somewhat differently esti－ mated：it can scarcely involve any ethical reference（＇deceitful，＇Ham－ mond，$\mu \hat{\nu} \theta \circ \iota \psi \in \nu \delta \in \hat{i}$ каi $\lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \circ \iota$, （Ecum．）， or any allusion to accompanying dan－ gers（Theod．，Theoph．），or yet to the results of the eloodos（De Wette i），as these belong to the second part of ver． g，－but，as $\gamma \in \gamma{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \in \nu$ and the leading idea in the following words（ $\epsilon \pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma$ ． $\left.\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \kappa . \tau . \lambda.\right)$ both suggest，to the essential character of the elloo $\delta o s$ ，its fulness of power and purpose and
 Chrys．So rightly De Wette 2，Lui－ nem．，and Alf．

2．$\alpha^{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ introduces the positive an－ tithesis to the preceding negative ov кєvウ̀ $\gamma \in ́ \gamma o v \epsilon \nu$ ；вее і Cor．xv． 10 ．Rec． reads $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{a}$ кaí，but has only the sup． port of a few mss．，and Clarom．
тротa日．каі $\mathbf{u} \beta \rho \iota \sigma \theta$ ．］＇having suffered
previously and having been injuriously treated,' Acts xvi. 22 sq.; 'id quod alios a predicando deterrere potuisset,' Beng. It is doubtful whether the participle is here concessive ('although we had, \&c.,' Lünem. ; see Plato, Rep. II. p. 376 a), or simply temporal. If kal (Rec.) were to be admitted in the text before the part., the former meaning would seem more probable, as in such cases the $\kappa a l$ (though not $=\kappa a l \pi \epsilon \rho$, De W.) serves to sharpen the antithesis involved in the concession (see Krüger, Sprachl. § 56.1 . 1 . 1 sq.) ; as however kal must be rejected, the simple participle seems here more naturally regarded as temporal; comp. Xen. Mem. II. 2. 5. So Auth., and appy.
 a $\ddot{a} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{\rho} \mu$. in the N.T. though not uncommon elsewhere (Thucyd. IIT. 67, Xen. l.c., Plato, l. c.), and serves clearly to detine the relation of time;
 pous кıvסívous $\dot{e} \nu \in \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \sigma \mu \in \nu$; comp. Syr. and ※th. (Platt). To this word the addition of $\dot{u} \beta \rho / \sigma \theta$. gives force and circumstantiality.
 $\mu e \theta a]$ ' we were bold of speech;' so distinctly Ath. -Pol. (but not Platt). It seems more exact to retain this primary meaning ; for though $\pi a \dot{\rho} \rho \eta=\sigma a$ has indisputably in the N.T. the derivative meaning of confidence, boldness (see on $E p h$. iii. 12), still after a comparison of Eph. vi. 20, and Acts xxvi. 26 (a speech of St Paul's), the idea of bold speech, even though reiterated in $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a l$, can scarcely be excluded. This $\pi a \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma l a$ was $\ell \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\mu} \nu$; it was in Him (not exactly 'per Deum,' Schott 1), as the causal sphere and ground of its existence, that the $\pi a \beta$ -
$\dot{\rho} \eta \sigma l a$ was felt and manifested. On the particularizing $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, see notes on Philem. 4, and Phil. i. 3.
$\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a l]$ 'so as to speak;' explanatory infinitive, defining still more clearly the oral nature of the boldness; see Winer, Gr. § 44. r, p. 285; so rightly De W., Meyer (on Eph. vi. 20), and Koch, who however appears (from his reference to Winer, Gr. p. 379, ed. 5) to confound this use with that of the inf. with rov. Liunem., Alf., and others, far less plausibly, consider the inf. as a simple object-infin. after $\epsilon \pi a \tilde{\rho} \rho \eta \sigma$. The ancient Vv . here give no distinct opinion, except perbaps Syr.-Phil., 'in fiducia (?) in Deo nostro loqui, \&c.,' where the inf. seems clearly regarded as explanatory: so too (appy.) Chrys. тò єủayy. тoû Ofov̀] 'the Gospel of God;' the Gospel which comes from Him, and of which He is the origin; gen. not of the object (Chrys. on Rom. i. r), but of the origin or originating cause; see notes on ch. i. 6. On the various genitives associated with ciar $\gamma$., comp. note on Eph.i. 13, and esp. Reuss, Theol. Ohret. IV. 8, Vol. II. p. 8I. $\quad i v \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ à $\left.\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\omega} \mathrm{vl}\right]$ ' in much confict;' not without emphasis : it was this fortitude amidst externaldangersthat peculiarly evinced
 does not seem necessary here to refer $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ to any internal conflict (comp. notes on Col. ii. r), but simply, in accordance with the context, to the external dangers by which they were surrounded; so Theoph., CEcum.: Chrys. appears to unite both.
 exhortation;' explanatory confirmation


## 

3. oúdé (2)] So Lachm. with ABCD ${ }^{1}$ FGN ; 6 mss. ; Copt. (Tisch. ed. 1). In ed. 2, 7, however, Tisch. reads oüre with $\mathrm{D}^{3}$ EKL ; nearly all mss. ; Chrys. (aliquoties), Theod. (ơ̈rc ...ỡт $\epsilon$ ), Dam., al. (Rec., Alf.), and with some plausibility, as ovió might be thought a correction for oó $\tau \epsilon$, which, though unusual, is here deemed not indefensible (comp. Schott, Alf.) : still, as this defence rests mainly on a doubtful use of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$,-as a recognition of the change of prepp. might have suggested a change from oư̇દ to oür $\epsilon$ nearly as probably as a non-recognition of it the converse,-and lastly, as the uncial authority very distinctly preponderates in favour of ov $\dot{\delta} \epsilon$, we revert to the reading of Tisch. (ed. r). So Winer, Gr. § 55. 6, p. 437, Olsh., De W., Lünem., Koch.
especially of the concluding words; of
 $\delta \delta a \sigma \iota \nu$, EEcum., compare Chrys. There is here, as Bengel acutely observes, an 'ætiologia duplex,' the present $\gamma$ d̀ $\rho$ introducinga reference to the Apostle's regular habit, the second $\gamma$ à $\rho$ (ver. 5) to that habit as specially evinced among the Thessalonians. The word $\pi \alpha \rho a ́ к \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$ here includes 'totum preconium evangelicum' (Beng.), and approaches in meaning to $\delta t \delta a \chi \eta^{\prime}$ (Chrys.), or $\delta i \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda i a$ (Theod.), from both of which however it is perhaps distinguishable, as being directed more to the feelings than the understanding; comp. notes on I Tim. iy. I3, and Beng. in loc. who says ' $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa$. late patet : ubi desides exçitat est hortatio, ubi tristitiæ medetur est solatium.' A good dissertation on $\pi$ apaка $\lambda \epsilon \hat{v}$, , a $\rho \dot{a}-$ $\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma t s$, and $\pi a \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \eta \tau o s$ will be found in Knapp, Script. Var. Argum.No.Iv.; see esp. p. 134 .
 'grounded on,' Alf. $I$, but 'having its source in,' Alf. 2, the prep. retaining its usual and primary force of origination from; see notes on Gal. ii. 16, Winer, Gr. § 47 . b, p. 329. The verb to be supplied is not ${ }^{\prime} 0$ (Syr., ※th.) but $\epsilon \sigma \tau \ell \nu$ (Copt.) ; as the Apostle is here referring to his general and habitual mode of preaching; see above. Lastly, $\pi \lambda a j \nu \eta$ is not trans-
itive, 'impositura,' Beza, 'seducendi studium,' Grot. (comp. Theoph.), but, as appy. in all passages in the N.T., intransitive, 'error,' Vulg., 12a-if [error]Syr., the context serving to show whether it is in the more abstract sense of 'mentis error' (Irrthum) as in Eph. iv. 14, or as bere in the more general meaning of 'bẹing deceived' (Irrwahn, delpsion), whether by oneself or others; comp. Theod., oúx zous $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \dot{\partial} u \epsilon \nu \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \nu \theta_{0} \lambda o-$


d,ka日apolas] 'impurity,' almost ' impure motives;' not apparently with any reference to the unclean and licentious teaching of $\mu a ́ y o l ~ k a i ~ \gamma o ́ \eta \tau \epsilon s$, Theoph. (comp. Chrys.), but, as $\epsilon \nu \pi \rho o ф a \sigma \epsilon \iota$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu \epsilon \xi i a s$ (ver. 5) seems to suggest, with reference to moral impurity (comp. notes on Gal. v. 19), more especially as evinced in covetousness (Olsh.) and desire of gain (Lünem., Alf.); comp. aloxpoкe $\delta \delta$ خेs as used in ref. to Christian teachers in I Tim. iii. 8, Tit. i. 7, and the charges that appear to have been brought against the Apostle hinself, 2 Cor. xi. 8 sq.
 any deliberate intention to deceive; not so much with reference to 'the manner in which' (Alf.), as to the ethical sphere in which the $\pi a \rho a \dot{k} \lambda \eta \sigma$ เs



was found, and by which it was, as it were, environed; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 2,

 what instructive parallel. The use of $\epsilon \nu$, especially with abstract or nonpersonal substantives, is always somewhat debateable in the N. T., and can only be fixed by the context; it sometimes librates towards dia both with gen. (I Pet. i. 5) and acc. (Matth. vi. 7), sometimes towards $\mu \in \tau$ á (ver. 17, Col. ii. 7 , iv. 2, see notes), sometimes, appy. very rarely, towards кard (Heb. iv. II), -but is commonly best referred to the imaginary sphere in which the action takes place; see Winer, $G r . ~ § 48$. a, p. 345 , and Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v., where this prep. is very fully discussed. On the reading of this passage, see crit. note, and on the most suitable transl. of ou...ou' $\delta$, notes to Transl.
4. каӨஸ்s $\delta \in \delta o k \iota \mu$.] 'according as we have been approved;' oúk aúroxєtpo-

 $\theta \eta \mu \in \nu$, Theod. KaOìs (see notes on Gal. iii. 6) has here no argumentative force (Eph. i. 3, see notes), but stands in correlation to oü $\tau \omega$ s, marking the measure or proportion existing between their approval by God to preach the Gospel and their actual performance of the commission. The idea of a recognition of any worth on the part of God in the $\delta \in \delta о \kappa \iota \mu a \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu 01$ (Cbrys., Theoph., Ecum.) is certainly here not necessarily involved in the word. $\Delta 0$ $\kappa c \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \nu$ is properly ( $a$ ) 'to put to the test' (Luke xiv. 19, Eph.v. ıo, i Tim. iii. Io , \&c.), thence by an easy gradation (b) 'to choose after testing' (see Rom. i. 28, with infin.), which again
passes insensibly into-(c)'to approve of what is so tested:' comp. Rom. xiv. 22, I Cor. xvi. 3, and notes on Phil. i. ıo. In the present case the appended notice of the subject in respect of which the $\delta о к<\mu a \sigma t a$ was exercised seems clearly to limit the
 каì $\epsilon \delta o \kappa i \mu a \sigma \epsilon \pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma a \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu}$, Theod.
 Gospel entrusted to us,' comp. I Tim. i. II, Tit. i. 3: explanatory infinitive serving to define more nearly that to which the doксцабia was directed, see Winer, Gr. § 44. 1, p. 285 ; compare Madvig, Synt. § 148 . For remarks on, and exx. of the idiomatic construction of the accus. rei with $\pi / \sigma \tau e \dot{o} \rho \mu a t$ and similar verbs, see Winer. Gr. § 32. 5, p. $204 . \quad$ oủx wis dive. dје́єккоитєs] ' not as busied in pleasing men;' the present tense having here its fullest force, and marking that which they were engaged in, were seeking to do; oúk $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \kappa \iota \nu \quad \theta \in \lambda$ доутєs, Theoph.; see Scheuerl. Synt. § 31. 2, p. 313 $^{13}$, and comp. notes on Gal. i. гo. The particle $\dot{\omega}$ s serves as usual to characterize the action, and to define the aspect in which the whole was to be regarded, ' not as striving to please men, but (as striving to please) God, se.;' comp. Bernhardy, Synt. vir. 2, p. 333, and notes on Eph. v. 22. $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ סокıц. к.т.入.] ' who proveth, trieth, our hearts ;' $\delta$ ox $\iota \mu$. here relapsing back to its primary meaning, see above. The plural $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ can here scarcely be referred otherwise than to St Paul and his fellow-preachers at Thessalonica: if the sentence had been general, it.would have been omitted (Rom. viii. 27); if the reference were simply

## 

to St Paul，the plurals kapbias and $\psi$ u＇xàs（ver．8）would seem wholly inap－ propriate．The art．before $\theta \in \mathscr{\varphi}$ （Rec．），though well attested［AD ${ }^{3} \mathrm{EFG}$ KLN＇${ }^{4}$ ］，seems due to grammatical cor－ rection，and is rightly rejected by Tisch．： it is inserted in brackets by Lachm．

5．Oйтє үáp к．т．入．］Confirmation of this general character of his and their Apostolic teaching by a special appeal to the experience of his readers；
 ＇came we［to share］in；＇scarcely ＇were we found enuployed in＇（comp． Lünem．），as the more distinct passive meaning cannot safely be maintained ： see notes on $E p h$ ．iii． 7 ；on the form， see note on ch．i．5．The Greek commentators（Chrys．，Theoph．）para－
 this however somewhat falls short of the idiomatic $\gamma / \gamma \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu a l ~ \dot{\epsilon} v$ ，＇in aliquậ re versor＇（Matth．Gr．§ 577．5，Vol． II．p．［004），and fails to mark the entrance into，and existence in the given thing or condition；see notes on I Tim．ii．I4．
 ＇sermone adulationis，＇Vulg．，＇verbo adulationis，＇Syr．，Copt．，＇blanditiis ．．．in voce，＇Eth．（Platt）；入oros having here its simple and proper meaning of＇speech，＇＇teaching＇（not coextensive with Heb． apparently not found in the N．T．）， and колакєias being a gel．－not of quality（＇assentatorio，＇Beza），nor of origin（＇ex adulandi studio profecto，＇ Schott），but of the substance and con－ tents；comp． 2 Cor，vi．7，Eph．i． 13 ， al．；and see Scheuerl．Synt．§ 12．1， p．182，Hartung，Casus，p．21．The word кo入aкela［possibly connected with $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ，Pott，Etymol．Forsch．Vol，I． p．233，or with $\kappa \delta \lambda \delta \frac{s}{}, \kappa \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega$ ，in sense of broken－spiritedness，cringing］is a ä $\pi$ ：
$\lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{\partial} \mu$ ．in the N．T．，and is defined in Pseud．－Plat．Def．p． 415 E（Vol．ix． p．272，ed．Bekk．）as $\dot{j} \mu \lambda \lambda\left(a \dot{\eta} \pi \rho o{ }^{\prime}\right.$ $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \grave{\eta} \nu$ à $u \in u$ toû $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau l \sigma \tau o v: ~ c o m p . ~$ Theoph．Charact．2．It serves here more specifically to illustrate the Ex $\delta \delta \lambda \omega$ of ver． 3 ，and forms a natural transition to the next words，the es－ seace of кодакeia being self－interest；

 кó入a $\dot{\xi}$, Aristotle，Ethic．Nicom．IV． 12 （ad fin．），comp．vill． 9.
 covetousness；＇＇prætextu specioso qua tegeremus avaritiam，＇Beng．The exact meaning of these words is not per－ fectly clear．Поó $\phi a \sigma$ is is not here ＇occasio，＇Vulg．，Clarom．，nor＇accu－ satio，＇Hamm．，nor even＇species，＇ Wolf，still less is otiose，Loesn．（Ohs． p． 376 ），but bas its simple and usual meaning of＇pretextus＇（comp．Copt．； $1 \triangle \Delta_{0}$ Syr．is somewbat indef．），while the gen．$\pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu \epsilon \xi$ las is a gen．objecti （comp．Scheuerl．Synt．§ 1 \％．I，p．126） serving to define that to which the $\pi \rho b \phi a \sigma i s$ was applied，and which it was intended to mask and conceal； comp．Xen．Cyr．II．1．25，$\pi \rho \delta \phi \alpha \sigma \iota s$ $\mu \epsilon c o \nu e \xi$ las，and see exx．in Rostu．Palm， Lex．s．v．（b），Vol．II．p． 125 I．The Apostle and his companions used no גójos which contained кодaкela，nor any $\pi$ pódaбts which was intended to cloke their $\pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu \epsilon \xi i a$ ．On the true meaning of $\pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu \varepsilon \xi t a$ ，see notes on Eph．iv．19，and on its distinction from фidapjupla，Trench，Synon．§ 24 ．
$\Theta$ eòs $\mu \mathrm{a} \rho \tau \mathrm{vs}$ ］＇God is witness；＇strong confirmation of the declaration imme－ diately preceding ；comp．Rom．i．9， Phil．i．8．The Greek commentators pertinently remark that in what men could judge of he appeals to his read．



ers，but in what they could not so distinctly recognise he appeals to God；





6．oùte 乌ךтoûvtes к．т．入．＇neither seeking glory from men；＇continued notice on the negative side of the characteristics of his own and his companions＇ministry ；$\zeta \eta \tau o \tilde{\nu} \tau \tau s$ being dependent on the preceding $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$－ $\mu \in \nu$ ，and the clause serving to illustrate ${ }^{0} \dot{\prime} \chi \dot{\omega} \operatorname{s} \dot{d} \nu \theta \rho$ ．d $\rho \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa$ ．，ver．4．It is very difficult here to substantiate any real distinction between $\dot{\xi} \xi$ and $\dot{a} \pi \delta$ ．The assertion of Schott and Olsh，that $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ refers to the immediate，$\dot{a} \pi \delta$ to the more remote origin，is true（see notes on Gal．ii．16），but bere inapplicable； that of Lünem．and Alf．，－＇that $\epsilon \kappa$ belongs more to the abstract ground of the $\delta \delta \xi a, \dot{a} \pi d$ to the concrete object from which it was in each case to accrue，＇ －is artificial and precarious．It would really seem more probable that they are here synonymous（Winer，Gr．§ 50．2，p． $3^{65}$ ），and that while in the first clause $\epsilon_{\kappa} \kappa$ might seem more idioma－ tic in immediate union with $\bar{\zeta} \eta \tau \in \tilde{i} \nu$ ，the digjunctive clauses into whicb it is ex－ panded might admit of and be lightened by the change to $\dot{a} \pi \delta$ ．St Paul＇s love of prepositional variation has often been noticed；comp．Winer，Gr．§ 50 ． 6 ，p．372，and notes on Gal．i．I．
סvvápevol èv $\beta$ ápet eival］＇though we could be of weight；＇concessive parti－ cipial clause subordinated to the pre－ ceding part．§ךroûyres：comp．Krü－ ger，Sprachl．§ 56.13 ．1，Donalds．Gr．
 is somewhat doubtful．Two interpre－
tations deserve consideration ：$\{a)^{\text {＇}}$ on－ eri esse，＇Vulg．，Eth．（Copt．baros， uncertain），$\beta$ ápos retaining its more simple meaning，and referring to the Apostolic right of being maintained by the Churches（Theod．）；comp．$\pi \rho \delta$ s $\tau \dot{\partial} \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta a \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma a t$ ，ver． 9,2 Thess．iii． 8 ，ou катєßáp $\eta \sigma a, 2$ Cor．xii． 16 ，and $\dot{\alpha} \beta a \rho \bar{\eta} . . . \dot{\epsilon} \mu a u \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \eta \sigma a, 2$ Cor．xi． 9 ： （b）＇in gravitate［honore］esse，＇Clarom．， and appy．Syr．${ }^{\circ}$ ［honorabiles esse；see Schaaf，Lex． в．v．］，$\beta$ ápos having its derivative sense of＇weight，＇＇authority ；＇comp．Diod． Sic．1v．6I，$\tau \dot{\partial} \beta$ ápos $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$（ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ l $\sigma \chi^{\prime \prime} \nu$, Suid．），esp．xvi． 8 （where it is associated with $\dot{\alpha} \xi(\omega \mu a)$ ，and somewhat similarly Polyb．Hist．iv．32．7，xxx． 15．I ：see esp．Suidas，s．v．Of these （a）is plausible on account of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi c \beta a \rho$ ．， ver．9：as however the concessive clause is closely appended to one in which $\delta \delta \xi a$ is the prevalent notion， and as the reference to $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \pi$ ó $\boldsymbol{\tau} \eta \mathrm{g}$ serves to enhance the eame idea by contrast， it seems more exegetically correct，and more in harmony with the immediate context，to adopt（b）；во Chrys．mo入－ $\lambda \hat{\eta} s a \pi o \lambda a \hat{\sigma} \sigma a \iota \tau+\mu \hat{\eta} s$ ，and less decidedly Theoph．and Ecum．
wis Xp．aंтóбтодоt］＂as Christ＇s Apo－ stles；＇the possessive gen．marking with slight emphasis whose ministers they were（see notes on Eph．i．i，Col．i．i）， and the term änóoto $\lambda o t$ receiving its more extended sense（see notes on Gal．i．1），and including Silvanus and Timotly．De Wette，Koch，al．，refer the plural solely to St Paul，but with－ out sufficieut reason．Though a refer－ ence to the Apostle＇s coadjutors must not perhaps be strongly pressed in


every case where the plural occurs, yet in the present passage the plurals кapolas (ver. 4) and $\psi u \chi$ às (ver. 8) seem distinctly to favour the wider application.
 the positive side, of the behaviour of the Apostle and his helpers, the $a \lambda \lambda a$ introducing an antithesis, not merely to the last clause, but to the whole of the preceding verse: they did not seek $\delta o ́ \xi a \nu$ as $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa a \lambda o c$, but, what was very different (see Klotz, Devar. Vol. 11. p. 2), evinced the affection of a parent; oú $\beta$ ápu oúdè кó $\mu \pi о \nu$ EX $\chi$ ov à ác$\delta \epsilon \iota \dot{\xi} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, Chrys. गेтเоь] 'gentle:' a $\delta i$ is $\lambda \in \gamma^{\prime} \mu$. in the N.T., here and 2 Tim. ii. 24. The epitl.et is similarly applied to a father (Hon. $O d . \pi .47$ ), to a ruler (Herod. ini. 89), to a god, Dionysus (Eur. Bac. 86r), as marking 'animi lenitatem in aliis ferendis' (Tittm.), and pointing to an outward exbibition of an inward $\pi \rho a o{ }^{-}$


 $\pi \rho \hat{a} o s$ (where however the derivation seems too much pressed), see Tittm. Synon. I. p. $1_{4}$ a, and notes on 2 Tim. l.c. The reading is doubtful: $\nu \dot{\eta} \pi \iota 0$ is most strongly supported [Lachm. with BC1D ${ }^{1}{ }^{F G} \mathbf{N}^{1}$; some mss.; Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Ath. (both), al.], but as a repetition of the N , owing to the somewhat common use of $\boldsymbol{\nu \eta \pi t o s ~ i n ~ S t ~ P a u l ' s ~ E p p . , ~ i s ~ m o r e ~}$ probable than that of an omission, and as $\nu \dot{\eta} \pi$ tos mars both the sense and metaphor, we seem justified in retaining $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \pi t o s$, with $\mathrm{AC}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL} \mathbf{N}^{4}$; great majority of mss.; Sah., Basm., Syr. (both). So Tisch., and the majority of recent editors. $\quad \boldsymbol{k} \nu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{v} \mu \omega \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{v}]$ ' in the midst of you;' scarcely, by an
anticipation of the image, 'sicut gallina pullis circumdata,' Beng.,-but, with a bint at the absence of all assumption of authority, 'as one of yourselves,' 'ut æquales idque cum omni-

 ẃs éd̀ трофós к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.] 'as a nurse (nursing mother) doth cherish her own children;' the particle w's having here not a temporal but simply a comparative force (Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p.
 quam si,' Vulg., Clarom., 'sicut,' Copt., Ath.,-and combining with $\epsilon$ àm and the pres. subj. in marking the habitude or perhaps rather the continuance of the objectively-possible event; see Winer, Gr. § 42. 3. b, p. 274, and comp. Herm. de Part. ä, p. 275. Green, Gr. p. 57 sq. Rec. reads $a ̉ y$ with $\mathbf{A D}^{3}(\mathrm{~K}$ ? $) \mathrm{LN}$; most mss. For exx. of somewhat similar usages of $\tau \rho 0 \phi o{ }^{\prime}$, see the list collected by Loesner, Obs. p. 377, and on the meaning of $\theta \dot{d} \lambda \pi \epsilon \omega$ [fostering warnith of the breast, comp. Deut. xxii. 6], see Krebs, Obs. p. 345, and notes on Eph. v. 29. The tenderness conveyed in the $\tau \dot{d}$ éautîs $\tau \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \nu a$ should not be overlooked; $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ фi $\lambda o \sigma \tau o p \gamma l a y ~ a u i \tau o u ̂ ~$ $\delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu v \sigma \nu$, Theoph. The present clause must not be marked off by a colon at $\dot{\mu} \mu \hat{\omega} v$ (Lünem.), but regarded both as an illustration of the preceding words, and as the protasis to the follow-
 ver. 8.
 affectionately, desiring you,' 'having a fond affection for you;' $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta v \mu 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon$, Hesych., Photius (Lex. p. 242), This form, though not found in the current lexicons (Rost u. Palm not excepted),

##  

is supported by all the uncial and more than 30 cursive mss., and rightly adopted instead of i $\mu \epsilon \epsilon \rho$. Rec.) by Lachm., Tisch., and most modern commentators. It is not compounded of $\delta \mu o \hat{v}$ and $\epsilon$ tect $\rho($ Thecph., Phot.), but is either ( $a$ ) a form of the shorter
 Winer, Gr.§ 16. 4, p. 92, or (b) a late and perhaps coarsely-strengthened form of the more usual i $\mu \epsilon$ l $\rho o \mu a t$, comp. Fritz. I, on Mark, p. 792. As it seems probable that $\mu \epsilon i \rho o \mu a l$ (Nicander, Theriaca, 402) is not an independent verb, but only an apocopated form of i $\mu \in$ i $\rho \rho \mu a l$ 'metri causa' (see Rost u. Paln, Lex. s.v. $\mu e(\rho \rho \mu$.$) , it seems safer$ to adopt (b), and to consider $\dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \mu \epsilon l_{\rho o \mu a t}$ as a corrupted and perhaps strengthened form of the more usual verb.
ov่т $\omega$...ev̉סok.] 'So ...had we good will;' the oütcs being connected not with the participle but with the finite verb. The verb evidok: is here not present, ' cupimus,' Clarom., but imperf., 'cupide volebamus,' Vulg. (comp. Copt., an-temat), the past tenses being commonly found in the N.T. with tbe more Attic $\epsilon$ ( (comp. Lobeck, Phryn. p. 140,456 ), not with $\eta \dot{v}$ as $B$ here, and a few MSS. elsewhere, see ch. iii. r [BN], 1 Cor. x. 5 [ABC], Col. i. i9 [ADE], al. The verb cúdok. is only found in writers after the time of Alexander (see Sturz, de Dial. Maced. p. 167), and appears to be commonly used in N.T. not as a mere equivalent for $\delta$ ок $\epsilon \omega$ (comp. Koch), but as conveying the idea either of the 'propensa voluntas' (Fritz.), or of the free, unconditioned, and gracious will (Luke xii. 32, Gal. i. 15, comp. i Thess. iii. 1) of the subject; comp. notes on Eph. i. 5, and esp. see Fritz. Rom. x. r, Vol. II. p. 369 sq. For a notice of
the constructions of evook. in the N.T., see notes on Col. i. ig.
$\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \delta o u ̂ v a l]$ 'to impart;' properly and specially connected with ro eviarर., but also by a very intelligible zeugma with $\tau$ às $\dot{\varepsilon} a u \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \psi u \chi$ ás, the compound verb being in the latter case understood in its simple form; comp. סoûva $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$, Mark x. 45. The use of $\mu \epsilon \tau a \delta i o ́ o ́ v a l ~ w i t h ~ a ~ d a t . ~ a n d ~ a c c ., ~$ though less usual than with a dat. and gen. (Jelf, Gr. §535), is not without example, especially when the partitive notion is owing to the context inadmissible; see Krüger, Sprachl. § 47. 15.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda{ }_{\alpha}$ каі к.т. $\left.\lambda.\right]$ 'but even our own souls,' ' nostras animas,' Clarom., Vulg.; not with any
 met ipsos' (Koppe), nor even merely 'nostras vitas,' but perhaps with a faint reference to the deeper meaning of $\psi u \chi \eta^{\prime}$, as pointing to the centre of the personality (Olshaus. Opusc. p. 154, Beck, Seelenl. § 1), our life and soul (Fell), our very existence, and all things pertaining to it. On the plural, see above on ver. 4, and ou the use of $\dot{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ with reference to the first person, Winer, Gr. § 22. 5, p. i36. The force of the strong antithesis ou $\mu o ́ v o \nu . . a \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \kappa a i$ is noticed in notes on
 'because ye became very dear (beloved) to $u s$;' surely here with no reference to the Agent by whom they were made so (Alf.), but simply to their having become so, owing to their eager and earnest reception of the Apostolic message; see notes on ch. i. 5. On the pronominal conjunction ocórı, here used in its slightly modified sense of ס̀d $\tau 0 \hat{1} \tau 0$ ö ôl (eo quod), 'quoniam,' Vulg., 'quia,' Clarom., see Fritz. Rom. i. 19 , Vol. I. p. 58 , but correct the


very doubtful statement（endorsed by Koch）that $\delta$ coot $\boldsymbol{\prime}$ is there equivalent to $\gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ or＇nam，＇see Meyer in loco．The reading of Rec．$\gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$ is only sup－ ported by K ；mss．；and may have been a correction to harmonize the clause with the supposed present $\epsilon \dot{\prime} \delta o \kappa$ ．
9．$\mu \nu \eta \mu \mathbf{\nu \epsilon v ́ \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon ~ \gamma a ́ p ] ~ ' F o r ~ y e ~ r e - ~}$ member；＇confirmation of the main declaration of ver． $8, \mu \epsilon \tau a \delta o \hat{\nu} v a \iota \ldots \tau \grave{s}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \psi v \chi$ ans，not of the more remote
 less of the subordinate causal member סtótı к．т．$\lambda$ ．（Lünem．；comp．Just．， Alf．），－a doubtful reference of $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ appy．suggested by limiting the term $\psi v \chi$ às unduly，and still more by find－ ing no allusion in the present verse to actual dangers．This however is not necessary：the Apostle and his fol－ lowers practically gave up their＇ex－ istence＇to their converts，when they spent night and day in toil rather than be a burden to any of them．M $\nu \eta \mu$ ． is of course the indic．pres．On $\mu \nu \eta$－ $\mu o v$. with the ascus．see notes on ch． i．3，and esp．on ${ }_{2}$ Tim．ii．8．Com－ pare throughout this verse 2 Thess． iii． $8 . \quad$ tòv кóтоv $\dot{\dagger} \mu \hat{\mu} \nu$ каl Tòv $\left.\mu \mu_{\mathrm{X}} \theta_{\mathrm{ov}}\right]$＇our toil and our travail，＇ the article being repeated to give em－ phasis to the enumeration and to en－ hance the climax ；comp．Wines，Gr． 8 19．5，p．117．The words кónos and $\mu_{0}^{\prime} \chi \theta$ 券 are again found connected in 2 Thess．iii． 8 and 2 Cor．xi． 27 ：the former perhaps marks the toil on the side of the suffering it involves（see notes on I Tim．iv．Io），the latter，as its derivation seems to suggest［con－ netted with $\mu o^{\prime}$ cs，and perhaps allied to $\mu$＇frs，see Mot，Etym．Forsch．Vol． 1．p．283］，on the side of the magni－ tude of the obstacles it has to over－ come：the connexion of $\mu \tilde{o}^{\prime} \chi \theta_{o s}$ with
day Cos（Koch，Ross u．Palm，Lex．s．v．） seems philologically doubtful；comp． Tot，lc．No． 373.
 and day；＇modal participial clause de－ fining the circumstances under which the ки́ $\quad$ voa was delivered．On the secondary predication of time диктòs kail $\dot{\eta} \mu$ épas，and on the strict gramme－ tical force of the gen．as pointing to some indefinite point of the space of time expressed by the subst．（contrast 2 Thess．iii．8，Rec．，Tisch．），see notes on I Tim．v．5．There is perhaps some emphasis in the collocation of the whole expression，but apply．none in the fact of $\nu u \kappa \tau 亠 ⿱ 八 乂, ~ p r e c e d i n g ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \mu \rho a s$ （Ale．），as St Paul always adopts this order；see further on I Tim．l．c．，and comp．Lobeck，Paralipom．p． 62 sq． The addition of $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ after $\nu v \kappa \tau \delta s$［Rec． with D ${ }^{3}$ EKL；mss．；Chrys．（text）， Theod．］，though partially defended by De W．，seems to have been an inser－ dion＇nexus causâ，＇and is rightly re－ jected by most modern editors． épya̧̧ónevot has here a special refer－ ene to the manual labour（Schott）of the Apostle and his associates；comp． Acts xviii．3．In I Cor．iv． 12 （comp． Eph．iv．28）the verb is enhanced by the addition tais lias $\chi \in \rho \sigma l v$ ．
 being burdensome to any of you；＇object contemplated in the voктòs kail $\dot{\eta} \mu$ ． $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma a \xi$ ．On this use of $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} s$ ，comp． Finer，Gr．§ 44．6，p．295，and on its possible distinction from els，comp． notes on 2 Thess．iii．4．The late form $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta a \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu}(2$ Cor．ii．5， 2 Thess．iii． 8 ， comp．Dion．Halic．Iv．9，viIi．73）is nearly but not quite equivalent in meaning to karaßapeiv（ 2 Cor．xii． I б）， the prep．in the former case being mainly directive（onus imponere），in



the latter mainly intensive; comp. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \pi \kappa \beta a \rho u v \varepsilon \epsilon \nu$, Exod. xxi. 30. The inference of Chrys., Theoph., that the Thessalonians were $\epsilon \nu \pi \epsilon \nu i q$ is very questionable; consider Acts xvii. 4,
 and comp. Baumgarten, Acts, Vol. if. p. 208 sq. (Clark).
eкпpug. cis
ن̂uâs] 'we preached unto you,' (م) Syr., Vulg. (Amiat.), ※th.; not 'in vobis,' Vulg., Clarom., Copt., the preposition being not equivalent to $\epsilon \nu$, but indicative of the direction, so to
 Matth. Gr. § $57^{8 .}$ b. It is singular that Winer (Gr. § 3I. 5, p. 191, ed. 6) should bave been induced merely by the plural following to adopt the less probable translation 'unter,' especially as in ed. 5 (p. 24I) he has added the more exact rendering 'Botschaft an die Völker gebracht;' comp. Mark xii. 10 , Luke xxiv. 47, i Pet. i. 25 .
 witnesses, and [so is] God:' statement in a collected form of what had previously been expanded into particulars. As the summary involves what could not be adequately judged of by man, the Apostle subjoins an appeal to God;




ís órics к.т.ג.] 'how holily and right. eously and blamelessly we behaved to you that believe;' characteristics of the behaviour of the Apostle and his associates, the adverbs $\dot{\delta} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega$ s k. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda$. not being merely adjectival, but serving as secondary predicates (Donalds. Gr. $\S 436 \mathrm{sq}$.) to define the form and man-
ner of the 'comparatum esse' involved in $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ : see Winer, Gr. § 54.2 , p. 341, Krüger, Sprachl. § 62. 2. 3. The adverbs are grouped together somewhat cumulatively, to express both on the positive and negative side the complete faithfulness of the ministry. The ordinary distinction between the two former ( $\pi \in \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi o u s \tau \dot{\alpha}$
 $\pi \epsilon \rho i \delta \epsilon!\theta_{\text {єous }} \delta$ óca, Plato, Gorg. p. 507 в; comp. Chariton, I. 10), urged here with some plausibility (Theoph., Alf., al.) on account of the preceding $i \mu \epsilon i s$ кal $\dot{o} \theta$ tós, is still always precarious in the N.T.; see notes on Eph. iv. 24, Iht. i. 8. Perhaps it is safer to say that $\delta \sigma i \omega s$ and $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega s$ form on the positive side a compound idea of holy purity and righteousness whether towards God or towards men, while $\dot{d} \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau \omega s$ (see Phil. ii. ${ }_{5}$, iii. 6) gives on the negative side the idea of general blamelessness in both aspects and relations. To refer $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau \omega$ s to Paul and his companions ('respectu sui ipsorum,' Beng.), or to regard it as merely the negative reiteration of $\delta_{l}$ кaiws in ref. to men (Olsh.), seems too restrictive; comp. Luse i. 6.
 believe;' objects in whose interest the behaviour was shown; dative of $i n$ terest, see Krïger, Sprachl. § 48. 4. Liunem. and Alf., following Ceum. and Theoph., and swayed by the position of the words and supposed passive force of $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \theta$., regard $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ as a dat. judicii; comp. Winer, Gr. § 31. 3. b, p. 245 (ed. 5 ,-omitted in ed. 6). This bowever seems very doubtful; the Apostle would scarcely have appealed to God in ref. to the judgment of the



Thessalonians; nor would an allusion to their estimate of a former line of conduct have been so pertinent as one to their consciousness that they were the interested objects of it. The addition roîs $\pi เ \sigma \tau$. is not otiose (Jowett), nor suggestive of different relations with unbelievers (comp. Theoph.), but enhances the appeal to the conduct displayed towards the Thess., by showing that their spiritual state was such as would naturally evoke it.
II. katditep ol8atє] 'even as ye know;' confirmatory appeal to the individual experience of his hearers; the
 $\phi l a$ of the Apostle and his companions was verified by its strict accordance ( $\kappa a \theta a \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \rho$ ) with what was observable in special cases. The genuine and expressive form $\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho$ ( $\kappa a \theta$ à marking the comparison, $\pi \epsilon \rho$ the latitude of the application, 'ambitum rei majorem vel quamvis maximum,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. 11. p. 722) is only used in the N. T. in St Paul's Epp. (I I times), and in Hebrews (ch. iv. 2, v. 4 Rec.), the later $\mathrm{k} A \theta$ ws (see notes on Gal. iii. 6) being the greatly predominant form. The simple к $a \theta a^{\prime}$ only occurs once, Matth. xxvii. so. is tiva Éкабтоv] 'how as regards each one of you,' 'unumquemque, nemine omisso,' Schott; the wis referring to a finite verb that has been omitted (see below), and the accus. being governed by the participles, and put prominently forward to mark the individualizing reference of the acts; $\beta a \beta a l$, èv тобoú $\tau$ $\pi \lambda \eta \theta_{\epsilon \iota} \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu a \pi a \rho a \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon i v$, Chrys. The collective $\dot{u} \mu \hat{s}$ s follows, as serving still more clearly to define that all were included: it is thus not so much a mere pleonastic repetition of the pronoun (Col. ii. 13, comp. Bernhardy,

Synt. p. 275), as a defining and supplementary accus. somewhat allied to the use of that case in the $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime}$ ${ }_{0}{ }^{\circ} \lambda о \nu$ каl $\mu \epsilon$ pos, Jelf, Gr. $\$ 584$.
wंs $\pi a \tau$ inp] Appropriate change from the image of a nursing-mother (ver. 7) to that of a father; the reference not being here to the tenderness of the love, but to its manifestation in instruction and education. The remark of Theoph..(suggested by Chrys.), äv $\boldsymbol{v}$

 $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau a \sigma l a v$, is thus not wholly appropriate. $\quad \pi а р а к а \lambda . ~ u ̛ \mu a ̂ s ~ к a l ~$ тарацuө.] 'exhorting you and encouraging you;' more exact specification of the behaviour previously described. The participles are certainly not directly (Copt.), nor even indirectly (by an assumed omission of $\dot{\eta}_{\mu \in \nu}$, Beza, al.) equivalent to finite verbs, but are either (a) dependent on $\epsilon \mathcal{\gamma} \epsilon \nu_{\eta}^{\prime} \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ supplied from the preceding clause (Lünem., Alf.), or (b) are used àvaкo-入ov́ $\theta \omega \mathrm{s}$, as modal clauses to a finite verb ( $=\epsilon_{\gamma} \epsilon \subset \nu_{j}^{\prime} \theta$. $\dot{v} \mu \hat{i} \nu$ ) that has been omitted, but is readily suggested by the context; 'ye know how we did so, exhorting you, dec.;' so appy. Theod.,
 к, $\tau . \lambda$., and probably Goth., which simply retains the participles. Between (a) and (b) the difference is practically not great; in the former case the par. ticiples form part of the primary, in the latter of the modal and secondary predication: (b) however seems preferable, both from the special consideration that thus the secondary predications of manner in ver. io find a parallelism in ver. $I \mathrm{I}$, and from the general consideration that these participial anacolutha are common in St Paul's Epp.: comp. 2 Cor. vii. 5, and

 $\delta \delta^{\circ} \xi_{\alpha \nu}$.

Winer，Gr．§ 45．6，p． 313 ．The verb $\pi a \rho a \mu \nu \theta$ ．seems here to imply not so much direct＇consolation＇ （John xi．19，31），Vulg．，comp．Syr．

corde vestro］，Copt．，Ath．，as＇encou－ ragement，＇see ch．v．14，yet not spe－ cially to meet dangers bravely（Ecum．）， but，as the context suggests，－to per－ form generally their duties as Chris． tians．

12．$\mu$ арторб $\mu є о 1] ~ ' c h a r g i n g, ' ~ ' c o n-~$ juring，＇＇quasi testibus adhibitis＇ （comp．Eph．iv．17），－not however $=\delta \iota a \mu a \rho \tau \cup \rho o ́ \mu$ ．（De Wette，Lïnem．）， which is obviously a stronger form； see notes on I Tim．v．I2．This sense of $\mu a \rho \tau \dot{v} \rho$ ．is abundantly confirmed by the use of the verb not only in later （Polyb．Hist．xiri．8．6），but even in earlier writers，e．g．Thacyd．vi．80，

 （Goëll．），－and is similar to though，as the context shows，not perfectly iden－ tical with（Koch）its use in Gal．$\nabla .3$ ， Eph．iv．17，where it approaches more nearly to $\mu$ aptvpoù $\mu a l$ ；see notes in locc．The reading is slightly doubtful：Rec．，Lachm．，read $\mu$ aptu－ poú $\mu$ ．with $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$ ；most mes．；Theod．， Theoph．，al．，but as the external evi－ dence in favour of．$\mu$ а $\rho \tau \nu \rho o ́ \mu$ ．$\left[\mathrm{BD}^{2}\right.$ （арру．） $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}$（арру．）KLN； 30 mss ； Chrys．，（Ec．：A omits кai $\mu a \rho \tau$ ．，and $\mathbf{C}$ is deficient］is of superior weight， and as $\mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \epsilon i \sigma \theta a c$ is always used passively in the New Test．，we adopt $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho o ́ \mu$ ．with Tisch．and the majority of modern critics ；see Rinck，Lucubr． Crit．p．91．кis то́ к．т．ג．］＇that ye should walk worthy，＇Col．i．10；de－ pendent on the preceding participles，
and indicating not merely the subject （Lünem．）or direction（Alf．），but，as els $\tau \delta$ with the infin．nearly always indicates，the purpose of the foregoing exhortation and appeal ：comp．Chrys．， who paraphrases by ${ }^{\nu} \nu a$ with the subj．， and contrast Theod．who paraphrases with a simple infin．The form $\operatorname{\epsilon is} \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{d}$ with the infin．is commonly used by St Paul simply to denote the purpose （comp．Winer，Gr．§ 44．6，p．295， Meyer，on Rom．i．20，note），and pro－ bably in no instance is simply indica－ tive of result（ecbatic）；still，as perbaps in the present case，there appear to be several passages in which the purpose is so far blended with the subject of the prayer，entreaty，$d c$ ．or the issues of the action，that it may not be im－ proper to recognise a secondary and weakened force in ref．to purpose， analogous to that in the parallel use of $\% \nu$ ；comp．notes on $E p h$. i． 17 ．
The present $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a r \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ is rightly adopted instead of the a．or．$\pi \epsilon \rho t \pi a \tau \hat{\eta}$－ aac（Rec．）by most modern editors on preponderant uncial authority［ABD ${ }^{1}$ FGN ；many mss．：C is deficient］．
Tov̂ кa入oûvтos］＇who is calling；＇not кa入є $\sigma$ avtos，as in Gal．i．6，and here in $A N$ and 8 mss ： the calling was still continuing as relating to some－ thing which in its fullest realization was future．It has been before ob－ served that in the Epistles the gra－ cious work of calling is always ascribed to the Father；comp．notes on Gal． l．c．，Reuss，Théol．Chrêt．iv．I5，p． 144 sq．，Usteri，Lehrb．II．2．3，p． 269 sq．On the＇vocatio externa＇and ＇interna，＇see the good distinctions of Jackson，Creed，XII．7．I， 2.
Baбレ入elav kal 8ógav］＇kingdom and

 as the word of God. Ye suffered from
your own people as we did from the Jews.
13. $\operatorname{\Delta ià~roûto]~So~Rec.~with~DEFGKL;~appy.~all~mss.;~Syr.,~Vulg.,~}$ Clarom., Goth., 㘴th. (both); Chrys., Theod., Theoph., Ecum. (De W., Lunem., Wortdzw.). Tisch. and Lachm. prefix кal with ABN; Copt., Syr.-Phil.; Theod. (ms. в), Ambrosiaster ( $A l f$.). The reading is thus very doubtful, as the addition of $N$ ( $C$ is here deficient) must justly be considered of great weight. I do not however at present reverse the reading of ed. 1 , 2 , till the peculiarities of $\boldsymbol{\aleph}$ (which is of very unequal weight in different portions of the N.T.) are more fully known to us; especially as it is by no means unreasonable to suppose that the кai was prefixed to help out the difficulty of connexion.
${ }^{\ell} \nu \delta o \xi o v$.(Olsh.), but, as all the Vv. rightly maintain (Syr., Copt., Nith., even repeat the pronouny, two separate substantives, the common article being accounted for by the inserted genitive; see Winer, Gr. § ig.4. d, p. 1 i6. The $\beta a \sigma i \lambda e l a ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ \Theta \varepsilon o \hat{v}$ is the kingdom
 (Chrys.), of which even while here on earth the true Christian is a subject, but the full privileges and blessedness of which are to be enjoyed hereafter; comp. Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 22, Vol. II. p. 244 sq., and the long treatise of C. G. Bauer in Comment. Theol. Part iI. p. 107-172. The $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$ to which He calls us is His own eternal glory, of which all the true menbers of the Messianic kingdom shall be partakers; comp: Rom. v. 2, and see Reuss, l.c. p. 253. Usteri, Lehrb. It. 2. B, p. 351 .
13. Did тоиิт0] 'For this cause;' as we have displayed this zeal and earnestness, we thank God that ye received our message in an accordant spirit: see note on ver. I. The exact reference of these words is somewhat doubtful. Schott and others refer the words to the 'effectum admonitionls' implied in $\epsilon i_{s} \tau \delta \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi$. к. $\tau . \lambda$. (comp. Jowett); De W., al., to the purpose and object of the preaching which the same words seem to imply, but thus
introduce a greater or less amount of tautology which it seems impossible to explain away. It would seem then, as Linem. correctly observes, that we can only logically refer them (a) to the specific declaration involved in the clause immediately preceding, scil. ört
 nem., Alf. ; or (b) to the general subject of the preceding verses,-the earnestness and zeal of the Apostle and his associates. Of these ( $a$ ) deserves consideration, but is open to the grave objection that thus $\delta$ dà $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau$ is made.to refer to a mere appended clause rather than, as usual, to the tenor of the whole preceding sentence. We therefore, it would seem with the Greek expositors, adopt (b); cúк ě $\sigma \tau \iota$



kal ทंpeis] 'we also,' not, as Alf. and Lünem., 'we as well as $\pi$ ávtes oi $\pi i$ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{u}_{0} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \epsilon s^{\prime}(\mathrm{ch} . \mathrm{i} .7$ ),-a reference far too remote,-but 'we as well as you who have so much to be thankful for:' the $\kappa a l$ involving some degree of contrast (see notes on Phil. iv. i2), and delicately marking the reciprocity of the feeling between ol $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \partial \nu ~ \Pi a \tilde{u} \lambda o \nu$ and the twice repeated $\dot{\nu} \mu \mathrm{i}$ is in the preceding verse ; see esp. notes on $E p h$. i. I5. De W. and Koch (so also Auth.)

##  

 decidedly at variance with the usage of the particlein demonstrative clauses, but involving a less error than the counter-assertion of Lünem., that we should then expect did кai $\tau 0 \hat{u} \tau 0$ : such collocations are very rare; see notes on Phil. iv. 3, and comp. Hartung, P'artik. кal, 4. 3, Vol. i. p. 143 .
 thanks to God.' On the meaning and usages of evixap. see notes on Phil. i. 3 , and esp. on Col. i. 12.
ठ'ть тарадаßóvтеs] 'that when ye received;' objective sentence (Donalds. $G r . \S 584 \mathrm{sq}$.) defining the matter and grounds of the eixapıotia. The par* ticiple is here temporal, and specifies the more external act that was either contemporaneous with, or rather immediately prior to the more internal $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \xi a \sigma \theta \epsilon$; comp. notes on Eph. iv. 8. The distinction between $\pi$ apa $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\nu} \varphi \epsilon \downarrow$ and $\delta \epsilon \chi \notin \sigma \theta a c$ stated by Lünem. and Koch, viz. that $\pi a \rho a \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{v} v \epsilon \epsilon$ points rather to an objective (Gal, i. 12, see notes), $\delta \in \chi \in \sigma \theta a l$ to a subjective reception ( 2 Cor. viii. 17), seems substantially correct, but must be applied with caution ; see notes on Col. ii. 6.
 i.e. 'the word which was heard,' or 'the word of preaching,' dкoŋ̀ being used in its passive sense which prevails in the N.T. (see notes on Gal. iii. 2; comp. Heb. iv. 2, and the Heb.
 LXX.), and the gen. being that of apposition or identity; Winer, Gr. $\S 59$ 8, p. 470, Scheuerl. Synt. § i2. I, p. 82, 83. The gen. dкon̂s is probably here subjoined to $\lambda \delta \delta$ os to introduce a slight contrast between the $\lambda$ ózos in its first state as heard by the ear and the same $\lambda_{o ́ \gamma o s ~ i n ~ i t s ~ s u b s e q u e n t ~ s t a t e ~}^{\text {at }}$
as $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma o f} \mu \epsilon \mathrm{vos}$ in the hearts of believers; comp. Rom. x. 17 -
$\pi a \rho^{\prime}{ }_{\eta} \boldsymbol{j} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ thus naturally belongs to тарадаßóvтєs (ch. iv. I, 2 Thess. iii. 6, comp. Gal. i. 12), from which it is only separated by the somewhat emphatic object-accusative; so Vulg., Syr., Copt., Goth. (Eth. omits $\pi a \rho$, $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu)$, Ecum., and a few modern commentators. The construction adopted by the majority of expositors, and perhaps Clarom., Syr.-Phil., גंкойs $\pi a \rho^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is defensible,-but harsh and unnatural, and probably only suggested by the unusual but significant position of the following rov $\theta \in o v$. . On the force of $\pi a \rho d$ as denoting the more immediate source, see notes on Gal. i. 12, and esp. Schulz, Abendm. p. 218 sq.

тov̂ $\Theta_{\epsilon o v ̂] ~ ' o f ~ G o d, ' s c . ~ ' w h i c h ~ c o m e t h ~}^{\text {ch }}$ from God;' $\theta \epsilon o v$ not being a gen. $o b$ jecti ('de Deo,' Grot.), nor the possessive gen. ('belonging to,' Alf. I), but a gen. of the author (De Wette, 'coming from,' Alf. 2), or even more simply of the source from which the入ó $o$ os áкoŋ̂s really and primarily came; see notes on ch. i. 6. The unusually placed roû $\theta$ eov̂ seems added correctively, the words being appended almost 'extra structuram,' to mark that though the $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{i}$ is were the immediate human source of the dкoŋ̀ its real and proper source was divine.
oú $\lambda^{\prime}$ yov div $\theta_{\rho}$.] ' not the word of men,' i.e. which cometh from them, and of which they are the true source; see above. It is incorrect to supply tacitly is: the Apostle, as Lünem. observes, is not stating how the Thessalonians regarded the message, but, as the next clause still more clearly shows, what it was as a matter of fact. The importance of this clause

 $\dot{a} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma_{\iota} \hat{\omega} \nu$ тov̂ $\Theta_{\epsilon} \hat{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ov̀ $\hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$

as asserting the direct Inspiration of the spoken words must not be overlooked.
ôs кal èvepyeitau]
' which also worketh,' 'is operative,' scil. the dóros $\theta_{\text {eô (Clarom., Syr., }}$ Goth., Theoph., (Ecum.), not $\theta$ © $\delta s$ (Vulg., Theod.), 一which in St Paul's Epp. is never found with the middle $\dot{\epsilon} \searrow \subset \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a u$, but always with the act.; see 1 Cor. xii. 6 , ir, Gal. ii. 8 , iii. 5 , Epl. i. ı1, al. On the constructions of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma$., see notes on Gal. ii. 8, and on the distinction between the active ('vim exercere') and the intensive middle ('ex se vim suam exercere'), see notes on Gal. v. 6, Winer, Gr. § 38. 6, p. ${ }^{2} 3 \mathrm{I}$, and comp. Kriger, Sprachl. § 52. 8. I sq. The кal must not be omitted in transl. (Alf.), or associated with the relative (De W., Koch), but connected with èvepr., which it enhances by suggesting a further property or characteristic of the Inspired Word, and perhaps a contrast with its inoperative nature when merely heard and not believed. On this use of кal, see notes on Eph. i. I I, Klotz, Devar. Vol. ir. p. 636 , and comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 69. 32. 12. iv $\mathbf{~ i \mu h i v ~ r o i t s ~ \pi r o t . ] ~ ' i n ~ y o u ~ t h a t ~ b e - ~}$ lieve,' not 'in vobis qui credidistis,' Vulg., which would require toîs $\pi t-$ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma a \sigma L v$, ner 'propterea quod fidem habetis,' Schott (comp. Olsh., Koch), which would require the omission of the article (comp. Donaldg. Gr. §492), but 'vobis qui creditis,' Goth., Syr.Phil., roîs mıбтévovolv adding a spi: ritual characteristic that serves indirectly to illustrate and verify the preceding declarations of the verse,
14. نiцeis Yáp] Confirmation, not of
their reception of the word (Ecum.), nor of the predication of their belief (Olsh.), but of the $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \in \rho \gamma \epsilon \epsilon a$ displayed
 imitation of the churches of Judæa in your sufferings is a distinct evidence of the $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \alpha$ of the word within you.' On the words $\mu \mu \eta \tau a i \epsilon^{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \theta .$, see notes on ch. i. 6 .
т $\hat{\omega} \nu$ oủ $\hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ kv Tn̂'Iov6.] 'which are in Judcea;' not 'præsens pro præterito,' Grot., but with a direct reference to the churches that were still existing in Judæa; comp. throughout Gal. i. 22. Why the Apostle peculiarly specifies these churches has been very differently explained. The most probable reason seems to be that as the Jews were at present the most active adversaries of Christianity, he specifies that locality where this opposition would be shown in its most determined aspects, and under circumstances of the greatest social trial : see Wordsw. in loc. $\quad$ kv $\mathbf{X}$. 'I.] 'in Christ Jesus;' 'in union and communion with Him ;' 'incorporated with Him who is the Head.' Both here and in Gal. i. 22 this spiritual definition is suitably subjoined, as still more clearly separating them even in thought from the $\sigma v \nu a \gamma \omega \gamma a i \tau \omega \nu$ 'Iov $\delta a i \omega \nu$ ( $(E c u m$.$) ,$ which might be $\epsilon^{2} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$, but were far in-
 Rec. reads $\tau a \hat{u} \tau a$ with $A D$; most mes.
 of your own countrymen;' closely dependent on $\epsilon \pi \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon-i \pi d$ being used correctly with neuter verbs which involve a passive reference, see Winer, $G r$. § $47 . \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{p} .330$ : the reading $\dot{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{\pi} \boldsymbol{\delta}$ [D1FG ; Orig. (I) in some ed.] is pro-



bably only due to a grammatical corrector. The supererogatory compound $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \nu \lambda$. ('contribulibus,' Vulg., i $\mu о$ $\epsilon \theta \nu \eta$ g, Hesych.) is a ar. 入є $\gamma^{\prime} \mu$. in the N.T.; it is not found in earlier waters ( $\pi 0 \lambda i \tau \eta s, \delta \eta \mu o ́ \tau \eta s, \phi \nu \lambda \epsilon \in \tau \eta s$, ar $_{\nu \in \nu} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ $\sigma u ́ v$, Herodian, p. 471, ed. Lobeck), and is an instance of the noticeable tendency in later Greek to compound forms without corresponding increase of meaning: comp. $\sigma \nu \nu \pi o \lambda i \tau \eta s$, Eph. ii. sg, and see Tbiersch, de Pentat. II. i, p. 83. These $\sigma u \mu \phi \cup \lambda \epsilon \tau a l$, as the contrast requires, must have been Gentiles; it is however not unreasonable to suppose that they were instigated by Jews ( De W.) ; comp. Acts xvii. 5, 13. kat's kail au'tol] 'even as they also;' not a grammatically exact, though a perfectly intelligible apodosis; comp. Demosth. Phil. I. p. 5 I , and Heindorf on Plato, Phoedo, § 79 (р. 86 A), Jelf, Gr. § 869. 2. On the repetition of $\kappa$ ai in both members of the sentence, by which ' per aliquam cogitandi celeritatem' a double and reciprocal comparison is instituted, see Fritz. Rom. i. I3, Vol. 1. p. 37, 38, and notes on Eph. v. 23. The aúroi obviously does not refer to the Apostle and his helpers [Goth., Ath.-Pol. (but not Platt), Copt.], but by a 'construction ad sensum' to the persons included in the more abstract $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \quad$ [Syr., Vulg., Carom., Arm.]; comp. Gal. i. 22, 23, and Wine, Gr. § 22. 3, p. 13 r .
15. т $\omega \hat{\nu}$ kail то̀v Kúp. к.т. $\lambda$.] 'who slew both the Lord Jesus and, \&c.:' warning notice of the true character of the unbelieving $J$ yews, suggested probably by recent experiences; comp. Acts xvii. 5, 13 , xviii. 6. The particle
kali is not ascensive, 'qua ipsum Dominus occiderunt,' Clarom., nor connetted with $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ (Lünem.), -a most questionable connexion, as $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ propertly considered has no relatival force, -but simply correlative to the following cai, 'et Dominum...et prophetas' (Vulg.; Copt. omits first cai), and introductory of the first of two similar and coordinate members; see Whiner, Gr. § 53.4, p. 389, and notes on I Tim. iv. Io. The position of $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ Kúplov is obviously emphatic, and serves more forcibly to evince the heinous nature of their sin. kail roves троф́́тas] 'and the prophets;' clearly governed by the preceding $a^{\pi} \pi о \kappa \tau \epsilon \tau \nu$. (Chrys., Theoph., (Axum.), not by the succeed. ing $\epsilon \kappa \delta \iota \omega \xi$ ávt $\omega \nu$ (De W., Koch). The counter-argument that all the prophets were not killed is of little weight, as 'mutates mutandis' it can be nearly as strongly urged against the connexion with ék $\delta \omega \xi$ द́vт. $\omega \nu$. The addition of this second member serves indirectly to weaken the force of the plea of ignorance (comp. Acts iii. r 7 ) : $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$



There is here a variety of reading: idious is inserted before $\pi \rho \circ \phi$. by Rec, with $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$; pappy. Syr., Goth., al.; Chrys., Theod., al., but is not found in ABD ${ }^{1} E^{1}$ FGN; 7 mss.; Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Orig. (2), Tertull. (who ascribes the insertion to Marcion); C is deficient. It was perhaps suggested by the preceding $l \delta i \omega \nu$ in ver. $\mathrm{r}_{4}$. It is thus rightly omitted by nearly all modern editors.
 ie. not merely St Paul and his helpers,


but the Apostles generally. The force of the compound $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \delta \omega \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \omega$ is somewhat doubtful: $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ does not seem otiose (De W.), nor even simply intensive (Lünem.), but has appy. a semilocal reference, 'qui persequendo ejecerunt,' Beng., Alf. ; comp. Luke xi. 49, and consider Acts xviii. 6. This meaning of $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \iota \omega \in \kappa \epsilon \nu$ does not seem to have been clearly recognised either by Chrys., al., or any of the best $V_{v}$., but is somewhat strongly supported by the prevailing use of the verb in the LXX. ; see Deut. vi. 19, I Chron. viii. 13, xii. 15 , Joel ii. 20, al. For j$\mu \hat{a ̂ s}$ Steph. 1550 (not Rec.) reads $\dot{v} \mu a \mathrm{a}$ probably by an error.
 not 'placere non quærentium,' Beng. nor aoristic 'non placuerunt,' Clarom., but, with the proper force of the tense, 'are not pleasing,' are pursuing a course displeasing to,-the present marking the result of a regular and contisuing course of behaviour; comp. Winer, Gr. § 45. 1, p. 304. The $\mu \dot{\eta}$ here does not seem to imply so much as 'Deo placere non curantium,' Alf, but is simply used to mark the aspects under which their conduct caused them to be presented to the reader; comp. Winer, Gr. § 55: 5, p. 429, and e8p. Gayler, de Part. Neg. cap. Ix. p. 275 sq. In estimating the force of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with a participle in the N. T. two things should always be borne in mind, (r) that $\mu \eta$ with the participle is so decidedly the prevailing combination, that while the force of ov with the part. will commonly admit of being pressed, that of $\mu \eta$ will not ; see Green, Gr. p. 122; (2) that it is not correct always to find in the $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (as Alf. here) a reference to the feelings or views of the subject connected with the partici-
ple) comp. notes on Gal. iv. 8), but that it sometimes refers to the aspect in which the facts are presented by the writer, and regarded by the reader; see esp. Winer, Gr. l.c., and Herm. Viger, No. $267 . \quad \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma เ \nu \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \theta \mathrm{p}$. Evavt( $\omega v$ ] 'contrary to all men;' soil. 'quia saluti generis humani per invidiam et malitiam obsistebant,' Est. 2, and in effect Chrys. and the Greek commentators. The usual reference of the to '̇vavtion to the 'adversus omnes alios hostile odium' entertained by Jews, Tacit. Hist. v. 5 (Olsh., De W., Jowett), has been recently called in question by Lünem., and satisfactorily refuted, ( r ) on the ground that thisexclusiveness, which had originally a monotheistic reference, would hardly have received from the Apostle such unqualified censure ; (2) on the grammatical principle that the causal participle $\kappa \omega \lambda \nu \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ does not add any new fact, but explains the meaning of what is appy. 'generaliter dictum' in the preceding words; so also Schott and Alford.
16. кш入vóvтшv] 'seeing they hinder;' not $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ ? [qui prohibent] Syr, comp. De W., but $\underset{\sim}{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\sim}$ [dum prohibent] Syr.-Phil,, 'prohibentes,' Vulg., the participle being anarthrous, and supplying the causal explanation of the foregoing assertion ; comp. Donalds. Gr. $\$ 492 \mathrm{sq}$. There is no idea of 'conatus' (De W.) involved in $\kappa \omega \lambda \nu \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$; the present simply states what they were actually doing, as far as circumstances permitted them; comp. Lünem.
$\lambda a \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma a \mathrm{l}$ tva $\left.\sigma \omega \theta \omega \bar{\omega} เ v\right]$ ' to speak that they might be saved;' not 'evangelium predicare ut ('qua,' Erasm.) salvæ


fiant,' Menoch. ap. Pol. Syn., but simply, 'gentibus loqui ut serventur,' Beza,- $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ preserving its ordinary meaning, and appy. coalescing with $i v a \sigma \omega \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \nu \nu$ to form an emphatic peri-
 will perhaps thus have a somewhat weakened force (see notes on Eph. i. ${ }^{1} 7$ ), and the final sentence will to some extent merge into the objective. On the nature of these forms of sentence, see Donalds. Gr. $\S 584 \mathrm{sq}$. and 605 sq . єis тò divan $\lambda \eta \mathrm{p}$. к.т.入.] 'in order to fill up (the measure of ) their sins;' final clause appended, not merely to $\kappa \omega \lambda v^{\prime} y \tau \omega \nu$, but to the whole preceding verse, and marking with the full force of $e l s \tau d$ (see notes on ver. $\mathbf{1} \mathbf{2}$ ) the purpose contemplated in their course of action. This purpose, viewed grammatically, must be ascribed to the Jews, 一whether as conscious and wilful ( $\sigma \kappa о \pi \hat{\varphi}$ tồ $\dot{a} \mu a \rho$ тávelvétolouv, (Ecum.), or as blinded and unconscious agents ( De W .) : considered however theologically, it mainly refers to the eternal purpose of God which unfolded itself in this wilful and at last judicial iblindness on the part of His chosen people; comp. Olsh. and Lünem. in loc. The compound $a^{2} \nu a \pi \lambda$. is not synonymous with $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{v}$, but marks the existence of a partial rather than an entire vacuum ; the Jews were always blind and stubborn, but when they slew tbeir Lord and drove forth His Apostles they filled $u p$ (supplebant) the measure of their iniquities; see notes on Phil. ii. 3o, and Winer, de Verb. Comp. III. p. II sq.
та́vтотє] ' a t all times,' ${ }^{\text {ºn }}$ [omni tempore] Syr., nat only in the imes before Christ ( $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega}$, $\pi \rho \circ \phi \boldsymbol{\eta}-$
$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu)$, but when He came, and after He left them ( $\dot{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \dot{a} \pi o \sigma \tau o ́ \lambda \omega \nu)$. There is no exegetical necessity for assuming that $\pi \dot{a} \nu \tau o \tau \epsilon=\pi a \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~s}$ (Bretschn., Olsh.): the Jews were always in all periods of their history acting in a manner that tended to fill up the continually diminishing vacuum.
 come upon them;' contrast between their course of evil and its sequel of punishment. It is scarcely necessary to say that $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ is not equivalent to $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ('enim,' Vulg.), but with its usual and proper foree ( ${ }_{\sim}^{\sim}$, Syr., 'autem,' Clarom.) marks the antithesis between the procedure and its issue ; 'alii rei aliam adjicit, ut tamen ubivis quædam oppositio declaretur,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. in. p. 362 . On the meaning of the verb $\phi \theta$ d́velv in later Greek (not 'provenit,' Clarom., Vulg. [Amiat.], but $\underset{y^{-}}{A_{0}}$ [advenit] Syr, and with eis 'pervenit,' Vulg.), see notes on Phil. iii. ı6, and Fritz. Rom. ix. 3r, Vol. II. pp. 356, 357. The aorist
 Transl.) is certainly not equivalent either to a present (Grot.) or to a future (Schott), but marks the event as an historical fact that belongs to the past, without bowewer further specifying'quam late patcat id quod actum est;' see esp. Fritz. de Aor. Vi, p. 17.
 narg.) with $\mathrm{BD}^{1]}$ was appy. an interpr. suggested by a supposed inappropriateness in the use of the aorist. The perf. contemplates an endurance in the present, the aorist leaves this fact unnoticed but does not exclude it.
ทं ópyn'] 'the anger,' scil. $\tau 0 \hat{u}$ Өєồ, which is actually added in DEFG;
 by Satan．Ye truly are our crown and glory．

Vulg．，Clarom．，Goth．；comp．Rom． v．9．The article either marks the $\dot{\partial} \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$ as $\pi \rho о \omega \rho \sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta$ кai $\pi \rho о \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \cup 0-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu \eta$（Chrys．2，3），or perbaps rather as $\delta \phi \in i \lambda o \mu e ́ \eta \eta$（Chrys．I，CEcum．），or even simply $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi \chi о \mu \dot{\epsilon} \eta \eta^{\prime} ;$ comp．ch．i． 10. cis $\tau$ enos］＇to the end，＇＇to the utter－ most；＇＇usque ad finem，＇Clarom．；in close connexion with $\epsilon \phi \theta a \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ，not with $\dot{o} \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$, －a construction that would certainly require the insertion of the article．Eis $\tau \epsilon \lambda_{c s}$ is not used adver－ bially（Jowett，－comp．Job xx．7）， whether in the sense of＇postremo＇ （Wahl，comp．Beng．＇tandem＇）or ＇penitus＇（Homb．），but，in accordance with the ordinary construct．of $\phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ cis $\tau l$ ，marks the issue to which the obrỳ had arrived ：it had reached its extreme bound，and would at once pass into inflictive judgments．As the cup of the $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a$ had been gradually filling，so had the measures of the divine $\dot{o} \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$ ．It can scarcely be doubted that in these words the Apo－ stle is pointing prophetically to the misery and destruction which in less than fifteen years came upon the whole Jewish nation．To regard the present clause as specifying what had already taken place（Baur，Paulus，p．483）is wholly inconsistent with the context： see Lünem．in loc．，who has well re－ futed the arguments urged by Baur， l．c．against the genvineness of the Ep．，derived from this and the pre－ ceding verses．

17．＇Hиєis $\delta$ €］＇But we；＇return after the digression to the subjects and leading thought of ver． 13 ，the $\delta \stackrel{\text { n not }}{ }$ being simply resumptive，but reintro－ ducing the Apostle and his associates with contrasted reference to the Jewish persecutors just alluded to：comp．the remarks on this particle in notes on

cं $\phi$＇$\dot{\imath} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}]$＇bereaved in our separation from you，＇＇desolati a vobis，＇Vulg．， （an on Syr．，temporal not concessive（Theod．） use of the participle，marking an ac－ tion prior to that of the finite verb； comp．Winer，Gr．§ 45.6 ．b，p． 315. In this expressive compound the ánd （reiterated before the pronoun）serves to mark the idea of separation（Winer， Gr．§ 47，p．331），and the term of $\rho$ 人a－ $\nu \dot{\sigma}, \dot{\partial} \rho \phi a \nu(\zeta \omega$ ，the feeling of desolation and bereavement which the separation involved．The further idea anaiown $\pi a \tau \notin \rho a s$ 广ךтov́vт $\omega \nu$ ，Chrys．（Esch． Choëph．249），or conversely，＇orbati ut parentes liberis absentibus，＇Beng．，is not necessarily involved in the term， as ópфavòs［cognate with＇orbus，＇and perbaps derived from Sanscr．rabh，the radical idea of which is＇seizing，＇\＆c．； see Pott，Etym．Forsch．Vol．I．p．259］ is not unfrequently used with some latitude of reference；comp．Pind． Isthm．viI．І6，ó $\rho \phi$ avò̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \dot{d} \rho \omega \nu$, Plato， Republ．vi．p． 495 c，$\dot{\partial} \rho \phi a \nu \grave{\eta} \nu \xi v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \omega \bar{\nu}$ ， and the good collection of exx．in Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．Vol．in．p． 542. The idea of separation from those we love seems however to be always in－ volved in the term，when used in re－ ference to persons；comp．Plato， Phcar．p． 239 ェ，$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \iota \lambda \tau a \dot{\tau} \omega \nu \ldots \kappa \tau \eta-$ $\mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ó $\rho \phi a \nu o ́ v . \quad \pi \rho \grave{s}$ кацрд̀v ©apas］＇for the season of an hour；＇ more emphatic expression than the
 5，Philem．15），or the less defined
 5），serving to mark the shortness of the time that elapsed between the bereavement and the longing expecta－ tion of return ；comp．the Latin＇boræ



momento,' Hor. Sat. 1. i. 7. On the use of $\pi \rho \delta \delta$ in these temporal formulæ, as properly serving to mark motion toward an epoch conceived as before the subject, see notes on Philem. I5 (where see also on the derivation of $\left.\omega_{\rho} \rho a\right)$, and compare Donalds. Cratyl.
 'in face not in heart;' scil. $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ alo $\theta \eta$ -
 àmo久aúw $\delta \iota \eta \nu \epsilon \kappa \hat{\omega}$, Theod.: datives, certainly not of manner (Alf.), but of relation ('of reference'), marking with the true limitiog power of the case the metaphorical place to which the action is restricted; comp. I Cor. v. 3, Col. ii. 5, see notes on Gal. i. 22, and esp.Scheuerl. Synt. § 22, p. 179 sq., where the distinctions between the local, modal, and instrumental, uses of this case are well illustrated.
тєр abundantly zealous,' ' eo amplius [magis] studuimus,' Beza,-viz. because our heart was with you, and our longing consequently greater. The exact reference of the comparative is somewhat doubtful. It is certainly not merely an intensified positive (Olsh., Just. 2, comp. Goth.) ; for though frequently used by St Paul (2 Cor. i. I2, ii. 4 , vii. $I_{3}, I_{5}$, xi. 23 , xii. $I_{5}$, Gal. i. I4, Phil. i. л4; comp. Heb. ii. I, xiii. 19), it has appy. in every case its proper comparative force; see Winer, Gr. § 35. 4, p. 217 . The most plausible ref. is not to the mere fact of the $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \rho \phi a \nu \iota \sigma \mu \delta s$ (Winer, $l . c$.), nor to the briefness of the time as suggestive of a less obliterated remembrance (Liunem., comp. Alf., Jowett), still less to the comparative length of it ( $\pi \epsilon \rho / \sigma \sigma o r$.

$\phi \theta \in \nu \tau a s$, Theoph., comp. Chrys.), but to the fact that the separation was $\pi \rho о \sigma \tilde{\pi} \pi \varphi$ о $\quad \kappa \alpha \rho \delta i \not q$; 'quo magis corde præsens vobiscum fui, hoc abundantius faciem vestram videre studui, Musc. The form $\pi \varepsilon \rho!\sigma \sigma o \tau \epsilon \rho \omega s$ ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma$ $\sigma \delta \tau \epsilon \rho 0 \nu$, Mark vii. $3^{6}$, 1 Cor. xy. io, Heb. vi. 17 , vii. 55 only) is appy. rare in classical Greek, comp. however Isocr. p. 35 玉. $\quad$ т $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi \pi \nu$ $\dot{u} \mu \hat{\omega} v$ l8єiv] 'to see your face;' not 'exquisite positum' for $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s$ i $i \delta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, with reference to the preceding $\pi \rho o \sigma \omega$ ' $\pi \varphi$ (Schott, Jowett), but appy. an expressive Hebraistic periphrasis (רָ (אֵת־פְּנִי), marking the personal face-to-face nature of the meeting; comp. ch. iii. io, Col. ii. I.
 appended clause specifying the ethical sphere in which the $\sigma \pi$ ovoì was evinced ('in multo desiderio,' Clarom., Copt., Goth.), or perhaps more simply the concomitant feeling ('cum multo desiderio,' Vulg., comp. Arm.) with which it was associated; see notes on Col. iv. 2, and comp. above on ver. 3 . 'E $\pi t \theta$. is seldom in the N.T. used as here in a good sense: see Trench, Synon. Part II. § 37.
18. Sıótı] 'On which account,' scil. of our longing to come and see you. The particle doótc is here used in a sense little different from otó (comp. Lat. 'quare'), and stands at the beginning of the period,-a usage in which Jowett and Lachm. appear to have felt a difficulty, as they place only a comma after $\epsilon \pi เ \theta$ uplq. Lachm. and Tïsch. (ed. 1, 7) read $\delta$ ó $\sigma_{6}$ with ABD1FGN; 9 mss. (Lünem., Alf.). Tisch. has here rightly returned to the reading of his first edition, as the ex-

## 


ternal authority for $\delta 66$（Rec．，De W．， Tisch．ed．2）－viz．（ $\mathrm{D}^{2}$ ？） $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$ ；great majority of mss．；Chrys．，Theod．， Dam．，al．（C is deficient）is not strong， and，owing to the unusual position of otort，the temptation to correct was
 wished，＇＇would fain；＇not $\dot{\eta} \beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$－ $\mu \in \nu$ ，which would have expressed＇ip－ sam animi propensionem＇（Tittm．） with a greater force than would be consistent with the context；comp． Philem．13，14．On the distinction between $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$ and $\beta$ oú $\lambda o \mu a t$ ，see notes on I Tim．v．14，and Donalds．Cratyl． $\S_{4} 6_{3}$ ，but in applying it in St Paul＇s Epp．observe that $\theta \in \lambda \omega$ is used 7 times to $\beta$ oúdouar once．This perhaps sug． gests that we may commonly with safety press the latter，but must be cautious with regard to the former．
 ego Paulus，＇ $\mathbb{t}$ th．The $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$＇solita－ rium＇serves to enhance the distinctive use of the personal pronoun（Hartung， Partik．$\mu \epsilon \nu, 3$ ．3，Vol．II．p．413）by faintly hinting at the others from whom for the sake of emphasis－not of contrastin conduct（ка́к $\hat{\epsilon} \nu o<\mu \bar{\epsilon} \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$
 Chrys．）－he is here detaching himself； comp．Devar．de Partic．Vol．I．p． 122 （ed．Klotz）．On the proper force of $\mu \epsilon \nu$（incorrectly derived by Klotz and Hartung from $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ ），and its connexion with the first numeral，see Donalds． Cratyl．§ 154 ，and comp．Pott，Etym． Forsch．Vol．11．p． $3^{24}$ ．
kal ämał kal 8［s］＇both once and twice，＇i．e．＇not once only，but twice；＇ see Phil．iv．16，and notes in loc．The first kal is not otiose（Raphel，Annot． Vol．11．p．522），but adds an emphasis to the enumeration；contrast Nehem． xiii．20， 5 Macc．iii． $3^{0}$ ，where the
omission of the rai leaves the formula scarcely stronger in meaning than＇ali－ quoties．＇кal èvéко廿єข к．т．$\lambda$. ＇and Satan hindered us．＇The кai has not here an adversative force（＇sed，＇ Vulg．，De W．），but simply places in juxtaposition with the intention the actual issue（＇et impedivit，＇Clarom．， and all the other $V_{V}$ ．），the opposition lying really in the context．On this practically contrasting use of $\kappa \alpha l$ ，see notes on Phil．iv．in，and Winer，Gr． § 53．3，p．388．On the primary mean．

 by breaking up as road，＇see notes on Gal．v． 7. $\delta$ इaravàs］ ＇Satan，＇Heb．并㘶，the personal evil Spirit，the＇adversary＇кат＇$\xi \xi \sigma \chi \eta^{\prime} \nu(o$ éx $\theta$ oós，Luke x．19）；comp．notes on Eph．vi．27．To refer this term to human adversaries（ De W. ），or to some inward impediment（Jowett，who most inaptly compares Acts xvi．7）， is in a high degree doubtful and pre－ carious：St Paul here plainly says that the Devil was the hindrance；what peculiar agencies he used are not re－ vealed．Without here entering into controversy，it seems not out of place to remark that the language of the N．T．，if words mean anything，does ascribe a personality to the Tempter so distinct and unmistakeable，that a denial of it can be only compatible with a practical denial of Scripture inspiration．To the so－called charge of Manicheism，it is enough to answer that if an inspired Apostle scruples not to call this fearful Being ó $\theta$ còs tô̂ al̂̂̀vos roúroù（2 Cor．iv．4），no sober thinker can feel any difficulty in ascribing to him permissive powers and agencies of a frightful extent and multiplicity；see Hofmann，Schriftb．

 $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\nu} \nu$ каi $\eta^{\prime} \chi \alpha \rho \alpha$.

Vol. r. p. 389 sq., Ebrard, Dogmatik, § 240, Vol. 1. p. 290, and Plitt, Evang. Glaubensl. § 31, Vol. r. p. 245 sq.
19. $\tau$ is $\gamma \dot{d} \rho \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}^{\mu} \omega \nu$ ] Interrogative confirmation of the Apostle's earnest desire to see his converts; ' who is so if ye are not so?' Olsh., 'quid mirum si tanto tenear vestri desiderio? nam quid aliud est in hoc mundo quo mihi placeam, quo me jactem, quo fretus mihi promittam felicitatem?' Calv.
 not exactly 'causa spei et materies lætandi,' Schott, but the subject and substratum of both one and the other, --the subject in whom both reside; comp. Phil. iv. f , and I Tim. i. I (see also notes) where this form of expression is used with the lighest emphasis. Examples of similar uses in pagan writers are collected by Wetst. in loc.; the most pertinent is Livy, xxviII. 39, 'Scipionem...spem omnem salutemque nostram.'
 ing;' comp. Prov. xvi. 3f, Ezek. xvi.
 LXX], and Isaiah lxii. 3 [ $\sigma \tau \notin \phi$. кd入dous, LXX]: the Thessalonians were to the Apostle as it were a chaplet of victory, of which he might justly make his boast in the day of the Lord. It is scarcely necessary to add that кau$\chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ not merely $=\delta o ́ \xi \eta s \quad \lambda a \mu \pi \rho \bar{a} s$ (Theoph.), but implies $\epsilon \phi^{\prime} \dot{\Psi} \dot{\psi} \dot{\gamma} \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0}$ $\mu a \iota$ [кav$\chi \hat{\omega} \mu a \iota]$, Chrys., the genitive being not the gen. 'appositionis' (Koch), nor even of the metaphorical substance (comp. Rev. xii. I), but, as the termination in - $\sigma \iota s$ seems to require, that of the 'remoter object;' see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 30. 2. $\beta$, p. 170 .
$\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ oủx $\mathfrak{k a l}$
úpeis] 'or is it not also you?' not 'nonne,' Vulg., but 'aut [an] non,' Clarom., $\underset{\square}{\text { \& }} 0{ }_{p}$ Syr.-Phil., the particle $\hat{\eta}$ retaining its proper disjunctive force (see Devar. de Part. Vol. I. p. ror, ed. Klotz), and introducing a second and negative interrogation, explanatory and confirmatory of what is implied in the first; comp. Winer, Gr. § $57 . \mathrm{f}, \mathrm{p} .45 \mathrm{I}$, and esp. compare the good remarks of Hand, Tursell. Vol. I. p. 349. The asoensive $\kappa$ ai serves to : place the Thessalonians in gentle con-trast with other converts, ' you as well as my other converts;' oú $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \in\{\pi \epsilon \nu$
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, Chrys. [How accurate is this great commentator's observation of the details of language.]
 the presence of our Lord Jesus at His coming?' 'There is some little difficulty in the connexion of this member with what precedes. We clearly must not assume a transposition, and connect it with $\tau i s \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho-\kappa a v \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ (Grot.), nor again closely and exclusively unite it with it oviरi kal i $\mu$ eîs (Olsh.), but, as the context seems to require, append it to the whole foregoing double question, to which it imparts its specifically Christian aspect. The A postle might have paused at $\kappa$ ai $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon i s$, and proceeded with ver. 20, but feeling that the $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \pi i s$, xapd, к. $\tau . \lambda$. needed characterizing, he subjoins the circumstances of place and time. 'E $\nu$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi a \rho o v \sigma i a$ obviously refers to the Lord's second coming,-not merely and exclusively 'to establish his Messianic kingdom' (Lünem., compare the objectionable rewiarks of Usteri, Lehrb.
 any longer，we sent Ti－ mothy to reassure you in your affliction．

p．352），but－－to judgment；comp．ch． iii．13，iv．15，v．23．The addition X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{u}$［Rec．with FGL；Vulg．（not Amiat．），Goth．，Copt．］is rightly re－ jected by Lachm．，Tisch．，and most modern editors．

20．ن́ $\mu$ кі̄s үáp к．т．入．］＇Yea verily ye are our glory and our joy．＇The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ does not appear here to be argu－ mentative，－i．e．it does not subjoin a reason of greater universality（Alf．， citing Soph．Philoct．756，but see Buttm．in loc．），but seems ratber con－ firmatory and explanatory（＇confirmat superiorem versum serid asseveratione，＇ Calv．），the $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ element having bere the predominance；see notes on Gal．ii．6， and Winer，Gr．§ 53．8．b，p． 396. For a complete investigation of the primary meaning and principal uses of this particle，the student is espe－ cially referred to Klotz，Devar．Vol． II．p． 231 sq．

Chapter III．i．Aló］＇On which account；＇not exactly $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ тठ̀ eivai úmâs
 which seems too restricted，but on account of the affectionate but abor－ tive desire expressed in the three preceding verses；$\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \bar{i} \delta \rho a \mu \epsilon \hat{i} v$
 $\mathrm{T} \iota \mu \delta \theta \epsilon \rho \nu$ ，Theod．On the use of $\delta \delta \dot{\sigma}$ ， see notes on Gal．iv．31，and gram－ matical reff．on Philem． 8.
 forbear；＇＇no longer able to control my longing to see or at least hear about you；＇＇cum desiderio vestri im－ pares essemus，＇Just．Lünemann（ap－ proved ly Winer，Gr．§ 55．5，p． $\mathbf{4 2 9}^{29}$ ） rightly objects to the assertion of Rückert that $\mu \eta \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \tau \iota$ is here incorrectly used for oúкє́ $\tau$, as $\mu \eta \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \tau \iota$ can be pro－ perly and accurately explained as in－
volving the subjective feelings of the writer（＇being in a state that I could not，＇＇as one that could not＇）；still， as has been before said（notes on ch．ii． ${ }^{15}$ ），the tendency of later Greek to adopt the subjective form of negation with participles is very noticeable，and must always be borne in inind；comp． Madvig，Synt．§207，and see also notes and reff．on ch．ii． 15 ．The verb

 I Cor．ix．i2）is only used in the N．T． by St Paul，twice with an accus．ob－ jecti（i Cor．ix．12，xiii．7，in both cases $\pi d \nu \tau a$ ），and twice without（here and ver．5）：see however the list of exx．in Wetst．on I $C o r$ ．ix．I2，and those in Kypke，Annot．Vol．II．p． 213 ，the most pertinent of which in ref．to this place is Philo，in Flacc． $\S 9$ ，Vol．II．p． $5^{27}$（ed．Mang．），$\mu \eta-$

єvंסoкฑंनapкv］＇we thought it good；＇ Auth．，comp．Arm．＇placuit nobis，＇ Vulg．，Clarom．，＇galeikaidauns，＇Goth．， not＇enixe voluimus＇［abedarna］Жth．， comp．Syr．［大ュ3］，as the idea
 Theoph．）rather than a＇propensa vo－ luntas＇seems here nore snitable to the context；see notes and reff．given on ch．ii．8．The plural here seems clearly to refer，not to St Paul and Silas（Beng．），but to St Paul alone， the subject of the verse being in close connexion with the concluding verses of ch．ii．，where（ver．18）the Apostle expressly limits the reference to him－ self．On the form $\boldsymbol{e}^{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \delta$ ．not $\eta \dot{J} \delta$ ．see notes on ch．ii． 8.

каталєьф $\theta$ ．
 at Athens alone，＇－alone，not without some emphasis，as its position seems to indicate；alone，and that at Athens，



'in urbe videlicet a Deo alienissimâ,' Beng. There is some little difficulty in reconciling this passage with Acts xvii. 14 sq. From the latter passage compared with $x$ vii. 5 , it would seem that Timothy and Silas first rejoined St Paul at Corinth, and so that the former was not with the Apostle at Athens; from the present words (кaza$\lambda \epsilon \iota \phi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota, \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \psi a \mu \epsilon \nu$, ver. 2 ; $\epsilon_{\pi} \pi \mu \psi \alpha$, ver. 5) however it seems almost certain that Timothy was despatched from Athens. Omitting all untenable assumptions-such as that a second visit was paid to Athens (Schrader), or that St Luke was ignorant of the circumstances, or 'that only Silas was left bebind' (Jowett),-we must either suppose ( $a$ ) that St Paul despatched Timothy before his own arrival at Athens (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 246 sq.), or perhaps more naturally (b) that Timothy, having been able to obey the Apostle's order (Acts xvii. 15) more quickly than Silas, did actually come to Athens, and was at once despatched to Thessalonica. The Apostle then continued waiting for both where he was (Acts xvii. 16), but ultimately left the city, and was rejoined by them both after his arrival at Corinth; see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 195, note (Bohn).
2. $\sigma v v \in p y o ̀ v ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ \Theta є o u ̂] ~ ' f e l l o w-~$ worker with God,' 'adjutorem Dei,' Clarom.; comp. I Cor. iii. 9. The $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu$ does not refer to others not named, but, in accordance with the regular construction of the word in the N.T. (Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21, Phil. ii. 25, iv. 3, comp. 2 Cor. i. 24), to the expressed and associated genitive $\theta$ eov̂ ; comp. Bernhardy, Synt. iII. 49, p. ז71, Jelf,

Gr. § 507.
The reading is somewhat doubtful, and the variations very numerous, but all may probably be referred to the supposed difficulty of the expression. Rec. reads кai
 with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}$. (confusedly) KL; most mss.; Syr. (omitting кai 1), Syr.-Phil. (but with asterisk to кai $\sigma v \nu . \dot{\eta} \mu$.), al.; Chrys., Theod. The text as it stands [Griesb., Lachm. (text), Tisch., and most modern editors] is only found in $\mathrm{D}^{1}$; Clarom., Sangerm., Ambrosiast., but is supported indirectly, (I) by AN; some mss.; and several Vv. (Vulg., Copt., Goth., AEth.), which have $\delta_{\iota d \kappa o \nu o \nu ~ i n s t e a d ~ o f ~}^{\sigma v \nu \epsilon \rho-}$ $\gamma \delta \nu$ (so Lachm. in marg.), (2) by FG; Aug., Boern., which have ס८́к. кal $\sigma v \nu$. roû $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, and also (3) to some extent by $B$, which gives кai $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma$. omitting $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ Өeov̂.
 the sphere in which his co-operation was exhibited; see Rom. i. 9, 2 Cor. x. I4, Phil. iv. 3 .
 and to exhort in behalf of your faith that, \&c.:' purpose of Timothy's mission; in the unavoidable absence of the Apostle, he was to strengthen them, and to exhort them to be steadfast; comp. $\dot{E} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \rho l \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ joined with тарак. Acts xiv. 22, xv. 32, 2 Thess. ii. 17. These expressions do not seem in accordance with the timid character which Alf. (in notes in loc. and on 1 Tim. v. 23, 2 Tim. i. 7, 8) ascribes to the Apostle's faithful fellowworker.
тарака入éval] 'to exhort,' 'ad...exhortandos,' Vulg.; not here 'to comfort,' Auth., Syr.-Phil., al. (Eph. vi. 22, Col.

## 

iv. 8), still less $\underset{\sim}{\text { ancos }}$ Us [roget vos de] Syr. (and so in ,
2 Cor. viii. 6, dec.), but, as the next verse seems to require, in the moreusual sense of 'encouraging' or 'exhorting;'
 $\dot{\epsilon} v a \nu \tau i \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta o u \lambda d \dot{d}$, Theod. The second $\dot{u} \mu a ̂ s$ which Rec. adds after $\pi$ apak. with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{KL}$; most mss.; Syr., is rightly rejected by Lachm., Tisch., with distinctly preponderant external evidence [ABD ${ }^{1} \mathrm{FGN}$; 15 mss.; Clarom., Vulg., Goth., Copt.; Chrys., Theod. ; C is deficient].
$\dot{v} \pi \grave{\rho} \rho \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} \boldsymbol{s} \pi(\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}]$ Not identical in meaning with $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi l \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s\left(D_{e}\right.$ W.), which Rec. here adopts on weak external authority [ $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{~L}$; mss.], but appy. more distinctly expressive of the benefit to, and furtherance of the faith, which was contemplated in the $\pi а р а ́ к \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$; see Winer, Gr. § 47. l, p. 343, and comp. notes on Phil. ii. 13 .
3. тò $\mu \eta \delta$ ह́va к.т.入.] 'that no one,' \&c. : objective sentence (Donalds. Gr. § $58_{4}$ ) dependent on $\pi$ apaкa $\lambda \epsilon \sigma a t$, explaining and specifying the subjectmatter of the exhortation; comp. Winer, Gr. § 44. 5, p. 294 (ed. 6), but more fully p. 375 (ed. 5). Of the different explanations of this infinitival clause, this seems far the most simple and grammatically tenable. That of Schott, according to which $\tau \delta \mu \eta \delta \delta \nu a$ к.т. $\lambda$. is an accus, of 'reference to,' is defensible (see Krüger, Sprachl. §50. 6. 8, comp. notes on Phil. iv. Io), but in the case of transitive verbs like таракалєìע of precarious application: that of Lünem. and Alf., according to which $\tau o ̀ ~ \mu \eta \delta$. is in apposition to the whole preceding sentence and dependent on the preceding els, more
than doubtful; the regimen is remote, and the assumption that $\tau 0 \cup \tau \varepsilon \sigma \tau \iota$ might have been written for $\tau \delta$ (Lünem.) or that it is nearly equivalent to it (Alf.) extremely questionable, if not inconsistent with the assumed dependence on cis. The only objection to the construction here advocated-that mapaка入є́ซal would thus be associated with a simple accus. rei-is of no real weight; for (r) such a construction is possible (comp. I Tim. vi. 2), and (2) the dependence of such explanatory or accusatival infinitives on thegoverning verb is appy. not so definite and immediate as that of simple substantives; comp. Matth. Gr. § 543, obs. 2, 3, Scheuerl. Synt. § 45. 4, p. 478. The only real difficulty in these and similar constructions is correctly to define the difference between the infin. with and without the article : perhaps it amounts to no more than this that in the former case the infinitival clause is more emphatic, aggregated, and substantival, in the latter more merged in the generalstructure of the sentence; see Winer, Gr. § 44. 2, p. 286, Krüger, Sprachl. § 50. 6. 3, Matth. Gr. l.c. obs. 2. The reading of Rec. $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu a$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. is not either exegetically or grammatically admissible (opp. to Green, Gr. p. 277; see Winer, l.c. p. 294), and is wholly unsupported by uncial authority. The text has the support of all MSS. except FG which give ${ }^{2} \mathbf{v a}$ (in the place of $\tau \delta$ ) with the infin.
бalveซta.l] 'be disturbed,' 'be disquiet. ed.' This verb (a $\ddot{\pi} \pi . \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$, in the N.T.) properly signifies 'to be fawned on' ( $\sigma a i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu, \epsilon \epsilon \pi i \zeta \omega \dot{\omega} \omega \nu \dot{a} \lambda \delta \gamma \omega \nu$, ö $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$ $\sigma \epsilon l \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ т $\eta \nu$ oúpd.v, Eustath. p. 393, 9), and metaphorically 'soothed' (Esch. Choëph. 194), but is occasionally found in later writers in the stronger sense



 comp. Dig. Laert. viIi. 4 (cited by
 крvov cal ${ }^{\mu} \mu \omega \zeta_{0} \nu$. So rightly Chrys. ( $\theta$ o $\rho \boldsymbol{\beta} \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a$ ), Theol., Zonaras, Lex. p. 1632 ( $\kappa \lambda$ oveí $\sigma 0 \alpha)$, al., most of the
 deretur], Vulg. 'moveatur'), and nearby all modern commentators. Wolf, Pittman (Synon. x. p. 189), and appy. Jowett, retain the more usual sense 'pellici,' sail. 'ad officium deserendumb,' but with little plausibility, and in opposition to the consent of both Ff. and $V v$. The derivation, it need scarcely be said, is not from इAN- or EAN. (Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. I. p. ${ }^{18} 8$ r), but from $\sigma \epsilon l \omega ;$ comp. Donald. Cratyl. § 473 .
civ $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ tais
 not merely those endured by the Aposte (comp. Exam.), but those in which both he and his readers had recently shared, and which, though apply. over for a time (ver. 4), would be almost certain to recur. The $\epsilon v$ is certainly not instrumental, nor even temporal (Lünem.), but merely local, with ref. to the circumstances $i n$ which they were, and by which they were (so to say) environed; comp. Wines, Gr. §48. a, p. 345. avitol $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ oifart] 'for yourselves know;' reason for the foregoing exhortation т $\mu \dot{\eta}$ naive $\sigma \theta a l$ к.т. $\lambda$.: both their own experiences and the Apostle's words (ier. 4) taught them this practical lesson.
els toûto
$\kappa \epsilon[\mu \in \theta$ ] ' $w e$ are appointed thereunto;' scil. $\tau \grave{\partial} \theta \lambda \backslash \beta \in \sigma \theta a \iota($ comp. yer. 4), not $\tau \grave{\partial}$
 referring laxly to the preceding $\theta \lambda\langle\psi \epsilon$ -
$\sigma \iota v$. On the meaning of $\kappa \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \theta a$ (Vulg.
 Goth. 'ratidai,' but?), see notes on Phil. i. 16 , and with respect to the sentiment, which is here perfectly general ( $\pi \epsilon \rho l \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \omega \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, Chris.), see 2 Tim. iii. 12 (notes), and comp. Reuse, Théol. Chrêt. iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 224 sq .
4. каl $\gamma \mathrm{d}$ р ӧтє к.т.入.] 'for verily when we were with you,' 'nam et cum,'

Syr. ; proof of the preceding assertion, rad $\rho$ introducing the reason, kali throwing stress upon it; see Whiner, Gr. § 53. 8, p. 397, and notes on Phil. ii. 27, where this formula is briefly discussed. On the use of $\pi \rho \partial{ }^{2}$ with acc. with verbs implying rest, \&c., see notes on Gal. i. 18 , iv. 18.
$\mu(\lambda \lambda о \mu \varepsilon v$ 0 $\lambda(\beta \epsilon \sigma \theta a u]$ ' we were to suffer affliction;' here not merely a periphasis of the future, but an indirect statement of the fixed and appointed decree of God; comp. vier. 3. The verb $\mu \Theta \lambda \omega$ has three constructions in the N.T.; (a) with the present,--in the Gospels and the majority of passages in the N. T.; (b) with the ar., Rome. viii. 18 , Gal. iii. 23, Rev. iii. 2, 16, xii. 4,-a construction found also in Attic Greek (Plato, Critias, p. 108 B, Gong. p. 525 A, al.) ; (c) with a Au-ture,-only in a few passages (Acts xi. 28 , xxiv. 15 , xxvii. 10 , in all three cases with $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { etc } \\ \sigma \theta a t\end{array}\right)$, though the use is the prevailing one in earlier Greek: see Winter, Gr. § 44. 7, p. 29<compat>ᄋ, Krüger, Sprachl. § 53.8.3 sq.
cal oi'Sart] 'and ye know,' soil. from your own experiences. The first kali

 $\kappa о ́ \pi о$ о́ $\dot{\mu} \omega \nu$.

When he came to us and reported your faith, we were greatly comforted, and are deeply thankful.

#   

does not here seem to be correlative to the second, кal...кai (see notes on I Tim. iv. Io), but apfears rather to have an arcensive force, while the second is

 $\pi \rho о \epsilon i \pi \epsilon$, каі $\xi_{\xi} \epsilon \beta \eta$, Chrys.
5. Sı̀ тov̂тo] 'For this cause;' scil. because the foretold tribulation had now actually come upon you. In the following $\kappa \dot{a} \gamma \omega$ the $\kappa a i$ does not belong to the sentence (the argument of Lünem. however that it would then be dia каi тоúto is of no weight, see notes on Phil. iv. 3) but to the pronoun, which it puts in gentle contrast with tbe $\dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{i} \boldsymbol{i}$ twice expressed in the preceding verse: as they had felt for the Apostle (more fully alluded to in ver. 6), so he on his part felt for them; comp. notes on ch. ii. I3.
 ing, able to contain;' see notes on ver. I.
 ing;' design of the $\begin{gathered}\text { E } \\ \epsilon \epsilon \mu \psi a, ~ c o m p . ~\end{gathered}$ ver. 2. It does not seem right to supply mentally aúr $\delta \nu$ (Olsh.; 'ut cognosceret,' Ath.-Platt, sim. Pol.); the subject of the principal verl is naturally the subject of the infinitive.
So rightly Syr. $\left.{ }_{\square}^{?}\right]_{n}^{?}$ [ut cognoscer$e m$ ]: the other $V_{\gamma}$. adopt the inf., or an equivalent ('ad cognoscendam fidem vestram,' Vulg., Clarom.), and are thus equally indeterminate with the original. $\quad \mu \eta \pi \omega s \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho a \sigma \in \nu$ к.т. ${ }^{\text {.] ] 'lest haply the tempter have }}$ tempted you;' aor. indic. specifying a fact regarded as having actually taken
place already: the temptation was a fact, its results however were uncertain (comp. Chrys.); see Winer, Gr. § 56.2, p. $44^{8}$, and comp. notes on the very similar passage Gal. ii. 2. It may be observed that Green ( $G r$. p. 81), Fritzsc̀he (Fritz. Opusc. p. ${ }_{1} \mathbf{7}$ note), and Scholef. (Hints, p. ir4) regard $\mu \eta \pi \omega s$ as dubitative in the first clause, and expressive of apprehension in the second, 'an forte Satanas tentasset...ne forte labores irriti es-sent,'--but with little plausibility. The argument of Fritz. that the $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \omega$ ws (metuentis) in the first clause would have required $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a t$ in the second ('atque ita labores irriti essent futuri ${ }^{\prime}$ ) is certainly not valid : the future would have represented something to occur at some indefinite future time, the aor. subj. is properly used of a transient state occurring in particular cases; see Matth. Gr. § 519. 7, and comp. Madvig, Synt. § 124. I, who correctly observes that $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with fut. after verbs of fearing, \&c. always gives a prominence to the notion of futurity. On the substantival form $\dot{o} \pi \epsilon \rho d\} \omega \nu$, see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 45. 7, p. 316, comp. Bernhardy, Synt. vi. 22, p. 316.
 comp. Gal. ii. 2, and the exx. collected by Kypke, Obs. Vol. iI. p. 275. The primary force of the prep. is somewhat similarly obscured in the adverbial
 see Bernhardy, Synt. v. ir, p. 22 I . On the meaning of $\kappa \delta \pi o s$, see notes on ch. ii. 9 .
6. *Aprt $\delta \mathbf{E}$ is most naturally con-

## $42 \quad \Pi P O \Sigma$ OE $\Sigma \Sigma A \Lambda O N I K E I \Sigma$ A.

##  

nected with the participle ( (th.-Pol. distinctly), not with the remote verb $\pi a \rho \epsilon \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$, ver. 7 (Lünem., Koch), which has its own adjunct סià $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau 0$; so appy. Syr., and probably all the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$, but the uncertainty as to punctuation precludes their being confidently cited on either side. The adverb ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \tau \iota[a \rho \omega$, connected with $\dot{\alpha} \rho$ tics, $a^{\dot{a} \rho \mu o i], \text { which properly stands in }}$ opp. as well to immediately present (vî, Plato, Meno, p. 89 c) as to remotely past time ( $\pi \alpha \alpha^{\lambda} \lambda a$, , Plato, Crito, p. 43 A ), is often used in the N.T. and in later writers in reference to purely present time; see esp. Lobeck, Phryn.
 'having told the good tidings of;' comp. Luke i. 19 : ouk eltey àmayrel-

 $\kappa$ кal $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ à $\gamma a ́ \pi \eta \nu$, Chrys. The verb cuaryed. is used in the N.T. both in the active (Rev. x. 7, xiv. 6, only), passive (Matt. xi. 5, Gal. i. ir, Heb. iv. 6 , al.), and middle. In the last form its constructions in the N.T. are singularly varied; it is used (a) absolutely, Rom. xv. 20, I Cor. i. I7; (b) with a dat. personae, Rom. i. 15; (c) with an accus. personce, Acts xvi. Io, r Pet. i. 12; (d) with an accus. rei, Rom. x. 15, Gal. i. 23 ; (e) with a double accus., personce and rei, Acts xiii. 32 ; and lastly ( $f$ )-the most common construction-with a dat. personce and acc. rei, Luke i. 19, al. Of these (b) and occasionally (c) are the forms used by the earlier writers; see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 267, Thom.-Mag. p. 379, ed. Bern.
 kal тìv ày. íp.] 'your faith and your love,' the faith which you have, and the love which you evince to one an-
other (ver. 12); $\delta \eta \lambda 0 \hat{\imath} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \pi l \sigma \tau \iota S \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon i a s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \beta \epsilon \beta a \iota o \nu, \dot{\eta}$ dé $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \tau \grave{\eta}^{\nu}$ $\pi \rho a \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu$ d $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$, Theod. The third Christian virtue, $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i s$, is not here specified (comp. I Tim. i. 14, 2 Tim. i. I $_{3}$, al.), but obviously is included; comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. I. 4, p. 24 I, Reuss, Theol. Chrét. iv. 22, Vol. in. p. 259, 260.
 $\mu \nu \mathrm{E}$ lav к.т.入.] 'that ye have good remembrance of us always;' not exactly $\mu \nu \eta \mu \nu \nu \epsilon \in ́ \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} \dot{\epsilon} \pi a i \nu \omega \nu \kappa a l \epsilon \dot{\jmath}$ $\phi \eta \mu i a s$, Theoph. (comp. Chrys.), but simply 'that ye retain a good, i.e. as the following words more fully specify, a faithful ( $\beta \in \beta$ alav, ©cum.) and affectionate remembrance of us,' ' ut nostra memoria bona sit in vobis,' Copt., comp. Syr. On $\mu \nu$ ela, see notes on ch. i. 2. The $\mu \nu \epsilon i a$ ajyaf̀ formed the third item in the good tidings; $\tau \rho i \alpha$

 $\mu \eta v$, Theod. $\quad \pi \alpha ́ v т о т \epsilon ~ s e e m s ~$ here more naturally joined with the preceding verb (Syr., Ath.), as in ch. i. 2, I Cor. i. 4, 2 Thess. i. 3, al., than with the participle (Copt.): the $\mu \nu e l a$ was not only $a j a \theta \eta$, but $\mathfrak{a} \delta i a ́-$ $\lambda_{\text {elm }}$ os; see 2 Tim. i. 3. So Auth., Arm., and appy. the majority of modern commentators.
 $u s$ :' further expansion of the preceding words; comp. 2 Tim. i. 4. On the force of the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \ell$, here not intensive but directive, see Fritz. Rom. i. II, Vol. I. p. 31, and notes on 2 Tim. l.c.
 also are longing to see you;' $\tau \delta$ रdे

 $\mu \nu \theta i a$ каl тарáк $\lambda \eta \sigma t s$, Chrys. On the meaning and use of $\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho$, see notes



8. $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \epsilon]$ So Rec., Lachm., and Tisch. ed. 2, with BDEN ${ }^{1}$; many mss.: Tisch. ed. 7 adopts the solecistic $\sigma \tau \eta \eta_{\kappa} \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ with AFGKL^ ${ }^{4}$; mss.; Cbrys. (ms.), which is maintained by Koch. The authority however is insufficient, as such permutations of vowels are found occasionally even in the best MSS.; comp. Scrivener, Introd. to N. T. p. 10.
on ch. ii. ir, and on the use of kai with comparative adverbs, notes on Eph. v. 23 .
7. Sเd тои̂то] 'for this cause:' in reference to the three preceding specifications, which are here grouped together in one view. Tbe resumed $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ тои̂тo is not superfluous (comp. De W.): the length of the preceding sentence, and the fact that ${ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \tau_{6} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \delta \nu \tau 0 s$ involved mainly the predication of time, make the occurrence of a recapitulatory and causal formula here by no means inappropriate.
 over you;' you were the objects which formed the substratum of our comfort; comp. 2 Cor. vii. 7. The prep. $\epsilon \pi l$ is not exactly equivalent to ' in,' Vulg., 'ex,' [fram] Goth., or even 'propter,' Ath.-Pol.,-still less to 'quod attinet ad,' Lünem.,-but with its usual and proper force points to the basis on which the $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$ rested, 'fundamentum cui veluti superstructa est,' Schott; see Winer, Gr. §48. c, p. 35 I. The reading $\pi \alpha$ paкєк $\lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, though found only in A and 3 mss., has been adopted by Koch, as according better with bis connexion of ápr $\rho$ with the finite verb. Surely this is most rash criticism.
èmi $\pi \operatorname{áa}_{\eta}$ к.т. $\lambda$.] 'in all our necessity and tribulation;' certainly not 'in quâvis angustiâ et afflictione,' Schott, -a translation distinctly precluded by the presence of the article, which
here represents the $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$ kal $\theta \lambda i \psi / s$ as a collective whole; comp. 2 Cor. i. 4, vii. 4- The use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ is bere only slightly different from that above; it has appy. neither a temporal (Lünem.) nor a causal ( 2 Cor. i. 4, but obs. the accompanying $\epsilon \nu \pi . \theta \lambda$.), but a semilocal force (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 4, and Mey. in loc.), marking that with which the $\pi$ apák $\eta$ चous stands in immediate contact and connexion; comp. Berohardy, Synt. v. 24. b, p. 248 sq., and notes on Phil. i. 3. In the former use the idea of ethical superposition seems mainly predominant, in this latter that of ethical contact; comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 68. 4 I . 5. It is somewhat doubtful to what the daparкך кai $\theta \lambda i \psi i s$ sbould be referred. On the whole, the force of à $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{d} \gamma \kappa \eta \text { [connected with A「X-, Pott, }}$ Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 184 ; 'vim omnem notat quæ evitari non potest,' Herm. Soph. Trach. 823] and the tenor of the context seem to imply not any inward distress (De W.), but rather some outward trial and trouble (Alf. compares Acts xviii. 5-10) under which the Apostle was then suffering; see Lünem. in loc.
The order of the words is inverted in Rec. ( $\theta \lambda i \psi$. к. $\left.\alpha^{2} \nu \dot{\gamma} \gamma \kappa \eta\right)$, but only on the authority of KL; mss.; several Ff.
 faith:' the medium by which this comfort was realized by the A postle was the faith on the part of the Thes-


salonians of which he had received tidings; aü̃ $\tau \dot{\eta} \dot{a} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon u \tau o s ~ \mu \in i \nu a \sigma a ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

8. ถ̈тเ vîv โิินє้] 'because now we live;' reason for the preceding statement of the comfort which he received from hearing of the faith of his converts. The contrast shows that the Apostle regards the ${ }^{\prime} \nu{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \kappa \eta$ каl $\theta \lambda i \psi k$ as a kind of death, from which he is raised to the full powers of life (comp. Rom. viii. 6) by the knowledge of the firm posture of the Thess.; $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$
 pà íто入aر $\beta \alpha_{\nu} \nu \mu \epsilon \nu$, Theod.; compare Pearson, Creed, Vol. ir. p. 319 (ed. Burt.). The couditional member, tà $\nu$ $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \mu \epsilon \mathrm{is} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. , shows that $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ (like the Lat. 'nunc') is not here used in a purely temporal (comp. Jowett), but in a logical and argumentative sense, approaching in meaning to 'in hoo rerum statu,' ' rebus sic se habentibus;' see Hartung, Partik. vîv, 2. 2, Vol. II. p. 25, Jelf, Gr. § 719. 2. The true principle of the usage is well explained by Hand; 'sæpe in his due rerum conditiones collocantur, quarum altera aut precessit, aut cogitatur esse posse, eique ex adverso opponitur ea quæ vera ac prasens adest et valet,' Tursell. Vol. Iv. p. 340.
eddv íseîs oтर́кךтє] 'if ye stand (fast);' hypothetically stated, as the faith of the Thessalonians was not yet complete (comp. ver. 1o); experience was yet to show whether the assumption was correct. On the force of $\dot{e} \dot{d} \nu$ with the subj. ('sumo hoc, et potest omnino ita se habere, sed utrum vere futurum sit neene id nescio, verum experientia cognoscam,' Herm.), and on its general distinction from $\epsilon l$ with the indic.; see notes on Oal. i. g,

Winer, Gr. § 41. 2, p. 260, and Herm. Viger, No. 312. On the meaning of this late form $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota$, not per. se 'to stand fast' (comp. Rom. xiv. 4), see notes on Phil. i. 27. In the N.T. it occurs only in St Paul's Epp. and Mark iii. 3 ( Tisch.), xi. 25 ; and in the LXX in Exod. xiv. 13 (Alex.).
iv Kup\{u] 'in the Lord,'-in Him as the element of their true life, and the sphere of its practical manifestations; so with $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ in Phil. iv. 1 ; see notes on Eph. iv. r7, vi. .
9. тiva үáp к.т. $\lambda$.] Confirmation of the preceding conditioned declara-
 say, for what sufficient thanks can be rendered to God for our plenitude of joy on your account?' тобaír $\eta$, $\phi \eta \sigma / \nu$,

 Theoph. For $\theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FG} \mathrm{N}^{1}$ read $\mathrm{K} u$ $\rho i \varphi$, and $\mathbf{N}^{1}$ also gives Kupiou for $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ at the end of the verse. divtamoSoîval] 'render,'-properly 'in return,' 'retribuere,' Vulg., $v_{i}^{\prime}-\Omega$ S. Syr.; edXapıotio is regarded as a kind of return for the mercies and blessings of God: Grot. aptly compares Psalm
 nary compound àvarooitooval is used by the Apostle both 'in bonam' and 'in malam partem' (2 Thess. i. 6, comp. Rom. xii. 19) in the sense of rendering back a due; the $\alpha \nu \tau l$ marking the idea of return, the $a^{\prime} \pi \sigma^{\circ}$ hinting at that of the debt previously incurred, 'ubi dando te exsolvis debito,' Winer, de Verb. Comp. iv. p. in.
 you;' comp. ch. i. 2 (and notes), I Cor. i. 4, 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13. The difference between $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ and $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho(E p h$. i.




16, comp. Phil. i. 4) in such combinations as the present is scarcely appreciable; see noter on Col. iv. 3, and comp. on Phil. i. 7.
 for, all the joy;' $\epsilon \pi l$ having here more of its causal and derivative sense, and marking the ground and reason of the
 i. 4, 2 Cor. ix. 15, Polyb. Hist. xviII. 26. 4, see notes on Phil. i. 5, and Krüger, Sprachl. § 68. 41. 6. The present use of $\epsilon \pi i$ is nearly allied to the common use of the prep. with verbs denoting affections of the mind, $\theta a v \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \iota$, à $\gamma \mathrm{a} \lambda \lambda \iota a ̂ \nu$, к. $\tau . \lambda$., but perhaps recedes a shade farther from the idea of 'ethical basis,' to which both this and all similar uses of the prep. are to be ultimately referred; see notes on ver. 7 , and Winer, Gr. § 48 . c, p. 35 I . It is scarcely necessary to say that $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \dot{\eta} \chi a \rho \dot{a}$ is not, except by infereace, 'summa lætitia' (Schott, -who however fails to observe the article), but 'all the joy,' Copt.,'the joy taken in its whole extent;' see Winer, Gr. § 18. 4, p. 1 ог: the Apostle's joy wanted nothing to make it full and complete.
ท̂ Xalpo $\mu \kappa v]$ 'which we joy;' attraction for $\eta^{\eta} \nu \chi$ रalooucy (Winer, Gr. § 24. 1, p. 147), the construction being appy. here $\chi$ aipeı $\chi$ дрáp (Matth. ii. ıo), not $\chi$ alpec $\chi a \rho \hat{a}$ (John iii. 29), which, though analogous, would be scarcely so natural with the simple relative. On these intensive forms, see Winer, Gr. § 32. 2, p. 20I, § 54. 3, p. 413 , Lobeck, Paralipom. p. 224 sq.
${ }^{\#} \mu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ к.т.入.] 'before our God;' furtber definition of the pure nature of the joy: it was such as could bear
the scrutiny of the eye of God, 'illo videlicet teste atque inspectore et ut arbitror probatore,' Just., comp. Calv. On the formula ${ }^{\prime \prime} \mu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \quad \tau 0 \hat{1} \theta_{\epsilon} \theta \hat{v}$, only used by St Paul in this Ep., see notes on ch. i. 3. The clause obviously belonge not to $\chi \alpha \rho \hat{g}$ (Pelt), still less to ver. 10 (Syr., but not Syr.Phil.), but to the verb $\chi a l \rho о \mu \epsilon \nu$.
10. vuктds кal $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho a s]$ ' night and day;' каl тои̂то $\tau \hat{\eta} s \chi^{a \rho \alpha ̂ s ~ \sigma \eta \mu e i o \nu, ~}$ Chrys. On this formula, see notes on ch. ii. 9 , and on I Tim.v. 5 .
 sure praying;' participial adjunct, not to $\chi$ alpo $\rho \varepsilon \nu$, which is only part of a subordinate clause, but to the leading thought tiva-à̀tanoooûrá (Lünem., Alf., Jowett), the participle not having so much a causal (Lünem.) as a circumstantial ('praying as we do,' Alf.), or perhaps rather a simply temporal reference; compare Krüger, Sprachl. § 56. ıо. I. On the rare cu- $^{\text {m }}$ mulative form $\dot{\pi} \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \kappa \pi$. (ch. v. $13[-\hat{\omega} s]$, Eph. iii. 20, Clem.-Rom. I Cor. 20 [- $-\hat{s}]$ ) and St Paul's noticeable use of compounds of $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho$, see notes on $E p h$. l.c. $\quad$ is $\boldsymbol{\text { t }}$ l8. к.т.入.] 'that we may sce your face;' 'ut videamus,' Vulg., Clarom.; purpose and object (iva liy aúrofs, Theoph.) of the prayer, with perhaps an incleded reference to the subject of it; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 2, and see notes on ch. ii. 12, and on $\dot{v} \mu$. Tè $\pi \quad \delta \delta \sigma$., notes on ch. ii. 17.

катартібаи] 'make complete,' 'at suppleamus,' Clarom. The verb кaтaptije, (Hesych. ката-
 properly signifies ' to make apprtos'the katà having appy. a slightly intensive force (see Rust u. Palm, Lex.

##  

g.v. кaтá, IV. 4),-thence 'to re-adjust and restore,' whether in a simple (Matth. iv. 21) or an ethical sense (Gal. vi. I), what bad been previously out of order; and thence, with a somewhat more derivative sense (as here), ' to supply what is lacking or deficient,' $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \alpha u$, Theod., àva $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha$, Ecum. For exx. see Wetst. Vol. I. p. 278, Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. p. 70, and notes on Gal. l.c.
 measures of your faith,' ' that in which your faith is yet deficient;' comp. Phil. ii, 30, Col. i. 24. These defects are referred by Olsh. to their faith not on the side of its power but of its knowledge. This seems substantially true (oủ $\pi$ á $\sigma \eta s \dot{\alpha} \pi e \lambda a v \sigma a \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta_{i} \delta a \sigma \kappa a$.
 Chrys., comp. ch. iv. I3) ; it does not however seem correct to exclude defects on the side of practice, which ch. iv. I sq. seems mainly intended to supply; see Lunem. in loc.
II. Aúrds 8 © к.т.入.] 'Now may God Himself and our Father ;' transition by the $\delta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \tau a \beta a r i x o ̀ y$ (see notes on Gal. iii. 8) to good wishes and prayers for their progress in holiness. The aútds does not seem here to suggest any antithesis between God and the deópevob, ver. io (De W.), but merely to enhance the power of God in respect of the катєu $0 \dot{\nu} \in \iota \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\circ} \delta \delta \nu$ (Luinem.), and to place in contrast the human agent with his earnest but foiled efforts (ch. ii. 18), and God who if He willed could instantly and surely accomplish all; $\dot{\omega} \sigma \in l \not \ell_{\lambda e \gamma \epsilon \nu}^{\prime} O$


 $\mu \in \theta a$, Eicum. On the meaning of the august title $\dot{\delta}$ Өєòs каi $\pi a \tau \grave{q} \rho$,
and the probable connexion of $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ with the latter subst. only (so also Lünem.), see notes on Gal. i. 4. It may be remarked that the copula is omitted in Syr., Copt., 居th. (both), and retained in Vulg., Clarom., Goth., Arm., Syr. Phil., but that in these latter Vv . where it thus occurs there is no trace of the explanatory force here ascribed to it by many modern commentators. kal ó Kíplos к.т. ${ }^{\text {.] }]}$ Union of the Son with the Father in the Apostle's prayer. The language of some of the German expositors is here neither clear nor satisfactory: we do not say with Lünem., that Christ as sitting at the right hand of God has a part in the government of the world 'nach paulinischer Anschauung' (compare Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4, p. 315), still less with Koch, that the Apostle regards Christ 'als die Weisheit und Macht Gottes,'-but assert simply and plainly that the Eternal Son is bere distinguished from the Father in respect of His Personality, but mystically united with Him (observe the significant singular катeutival) in respect of his Godhead, and as God rightly and duly addressed in the language of direct prayer; see esp. Athan. contr. Arian. III. If, Waterl. Defence, Qu. xvir. Vol. I. p. $4^{23}$, Qu. XxII. p. 467.
The addition after 'I $\eta \sigma$. of Xpiotós (Rec.), though supported by $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EFGK}$ L; mass. ; Vv.; Ath., and many Ff., is rightly rejected by most modern editors with $\mathrm{ABD}^{2} \mathrm{~K}^{( } \mathrm{D}^{1}$ omits ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$. as well) ; 5 mss.; Clarom., Sangerm., Vulg. (Amiat.), Ath. (Pol.,-but not Platt), al., as a conformation to the more usual formula.
катevévar] 'direct;' optative, not in-finitive,-which, though occasionally



found in older and esp. poetical writers in ref. to wishes and prayers (Apollon. de Synt. mir. i4, Bernhardy, Synt. Ix. 3, p. 357), has no place in the language of the N.T.; see Winer, Gr. § 43. 5, p. 283 . The singular is certainly very noticeable both here and in 2 Thess, ii. 17: no reasons except those founded on the true relations of the Fatber and Son seem in any way to account for the enallage of number. The verb кarevөivecy (Luke i. 79, 2 Thess. iii. 5) properly signifies 'to make straight,' thence (as here) 'to direct' ('dirigat,' Vulg., $j^{\circ} \dot{\beta} \Delta \Delta$ Syr.), the kard being appy. not so much intensive (Koch) as directive, and the appended $\pi \rho \partial s$ specifying the terminus ad quem; comp. Winer, $G$ r. § 52.4.9, p. 383 .
12. ن̊ $\mathbf{\mu a ̂ s}$ 8t] ' But you,'-youwhatever it may please God to appoint with respect to us and our coming: ' altera precatio ut interea dum obstructum illi est iter se tamen absente DominusThessalonicenses confirmet in sanctitate et caritate impleat,' Calv.
í Kúpos]
Not the First Person of the blessed Trinity (Alf.),-still less the Third (Basil, ap. Pearson, Creed, Vol. in. p. 265, ed. Burt.), but, in accordance with the application of the title both in ver. II and ver. I3, and the prevailing usage in St Paul's Epp., the Second; comp. Winer, Gr. § ig. r, p. 113. The subject $\dot{o}$ Kúpos [so $\mathrm{BD}^{3} \mathrm{~K}$
 'I $\eta$ roûs, $D^{1} E^{1} F G$; Clarom., Sangerm., al.] is omitted in Syr., Arab. (Erp.), Vulg. (Amiat.), and is rejected by Mill (Prolegom. p. cxxx.), De W.,

Koch, al., as an interpolation. The external authority for its insertion is too preponderant to be safely set aside: Lachm. and Tisch. retain it. $\pi \lambda \epsilon o v a ́ \sigma a l$ кal $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \sigma \sigma \in v ́ \sigma a l]$ ' make to increase and abound,' 'multiplicet et abundare faciat,' Vulg., Clarom.; both verbs transitive, and nearly synonymous; the former referring not to mere numerical increase ( $\tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{a} \rho t \theta \mu \hat{\varphi}$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \iota$, Theod.) but to spiritual enlargement, the second to spiritual abundance, and having more of a superlative meaning; comp. Fritz. Rom. Vol. I. p. 351. ח入eovd 5 etv is not transitive elsewhere in the N. T., see however Psalm lxxi. 21, 白 $\pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma^{\prime}-$ $\nu a \sigma a s ~ \tau \eta \eta \nu \delta ı \kappa a \iota o \sigma u ́ v \eta \nu$ бov, I Mace. iv. $35, \pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu \alpha \sigma a s ~ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ ү $\epsilon \nu \eta \theta \dot{\ell} \nu \tau a \quad \sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ \nu ;$ the verb $\pi \epsilon \rho \ell \sigma \sigma$. is also commonly intrans., but see 2 Cor. iv. 15 , ix. 8, and notes on Eph. i. 8.
 ward one another and toward all;' instrumental or rather ablatival dative specifying that with which they were to be enlarged and to abound; see Hartung, Casu8, p. 94, Scheuerl. Synt. § 22, p. 178, 182. This love was to be shown both in the form of brotherly love ( $\phi i \lambda a \delta \in \lambda \phi i a$, ch. iv. g) and in its more extended form to all mankind whether $\dot{\delta} \mu$ óтเбтol (Theod.) or not;
 $\tau \grave{~ \pi}$ divтаs $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, Theoph.
 we also abound toward you;' comp. ver. 6; scil. $\pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu d 5 о \mu \epsilon \nu$ каl $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma$ -
 $\mu \epsilon v$, Theod.], the verbs which were previously transitive now relapsing into their usual intransitive meaning:


#  $\kappa \alpha \grave{i} \pi \alpha \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho o v \sigma i a q ~ \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ Kupiou $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ ${ }^{\prime} I \eta \sigma o u ̂ \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \gamma^{\prime} \omega \nu$ aù $\tau o u ̂$. 

тepod à $\xi$ Łoû $\mu \in \nu \quad \gamma \in \nu \in ́ \sigma \theta a \mathrm{a}$, Chrys. This mode of supplying the ellipsis, though open to the objection of causing two different meanings to be assigned to $\pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu$. and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$. in the same verse, seems less arbitrary than that of Syr.
 Grot. 'sumus, more Hebræo,' \&c., and is supported by the analogy of simple verlus being supplied from compound verbs, affirmative from regative ; comp. Jelf, $G r . \$ 895$. I. b.
On the meanng of каө்́тєр, see notes on ch. ii. ir, and on the use of кat, notes on ch. iv. 5 .
 establish,' 'to the end he may stablish,' Auth.; not the result (Baumg.-Crus.) but the end and aim of the $\pi \lambda \epsilon o v$. xal
 $\sigma \in u ̛ \eta, \sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota \gamma \mu{ }_{0}^{\prime} \leqslant \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ кєк $\tau \eta \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ aúvíy, (Ecum.; love being, as De W. observes, 'the filling up of the law' (Rom. xiii. Io) and 'the bond of perfectness' (Col. iii. 14). The subject of the inf., it need scarcely be said, is not $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ (Corn. a Lap. i), nor ááa$\pi \eta \nu$ (Ecum.), nor even Өcóv (a Lap. 2), but the subject of the foregoing verse, $\tau \delta \nu$ Kúpıov. $\quad \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o u s$ द̀v á $\gamma \omega \omega \sigma$ v́vn] 'so as to be unblameable in holiness;' proleptic use of the adjective ; comp. 1 Cor. i. 8, Phil. iii. 2 I, see Winer, Gr. § 66. 3, p. 550, Jelf, Gr. § 439.2 , Schaefer, Demosth. Vol. I. p. 239, and the long and elaborate note of Koch in loc. The hearts ( $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{K}}$
 $\nu \eta \rho o i$, Chrys.) were to be blameless, and that not simply, but in a sphere and element of holiness. On the orthographically correct but late form $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \boldsymbol{\omega} \omega \sigma^{\prime} \nu \eta$ (Rom. i. 4, 2 Cor. vii. I, as

N, not à $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \imath \sigma$ óv $\delta_{\kappa \kappa \alpha}$ oбív $\eta$ ), see Fritz. Rom. Vol. I. p. 10, Buttm. Gr. § ir8. ir. In meaning it differs but little from $\dot{a} \gamma \mathrm{\gamma} b \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ (2 Cor. i. 12 [not Rec.], Heb. xii. 10), except perhaps that it represents more the condition than the abstract quality, while $\dot{a} \gamma$ ca $\sigma \mu_{o}^{\prime} s$, as its termination shows, points primarily to the process (2 Thess. ii. г3, I Pet. i. 2), and thence, with that gradual approach of the termination in - $\mu$ os to that in - $\sigma \nu \nu \eta$ which is so characteristic of the N.T., the state (ch. iv. 4, I Tim. ii. I5), frame of mind, or holy disposition (Waterland, on Justif. Vol. vi. p. 7), in which the action of the verb is evinced and exemplified ; see Usteri, Lehrb. II. 1. 3, p. 226, and comp. a $\gamma a \theta \omega \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta \eta$, dं ${ }^{\text {a }}$ óót $\eta$ s, and notes on Gal. v. 22.
${ }^{4} \mu \pi \rho o \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. does not belong exclusively either to $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \dot{a} y \omega \omega \sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \eta$ (Pelt) or to $a^{\mu} \mu \mu \pi$ tous (De W.), but to both (Liunem.) : their $\dot{a}_{\mu \epsilon \mu \phi i a}^{e} \dot{v} \dot{a} \nmid \omega \sigma$. was to be such as could bear the searching eye of God; see notes on ver. 9 , and on ch. i. 3 .
тov̂ Ө. кal $\pi$. $\eta^{\prime} \mu$.] See notes on ver. 11, and on Gal. i. 4. èv rin mapovoia к.т.ג.] 'at the coming of our Lord Jesus;' кal $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ i $\pi$ ' aitrô
 Theoph. ; see notes on ch. ii. 19. The addition $\mathrm{X}_{\rho \iota \sigma \tau 00}$ is rightly rejected by Lachm. and Tisch., with ABDEKN; 20 mss ; Clarom., Sangerm., Vulg. (Amiat.), 左th. (Pol.,-but not Platt); Dam., Ambr. : the appearance of 'I $\eta$. $\sigma o u s s$ without $\mathrm{X} \rho \stackrel{\sigma}{ }{ }^{\circ} \delta \mathrm{s}$ seems somewhat noticeably frequent in this Epistle (9 times out of 16 ); comp. ver. II, ch. i. 10, ii. 15,19 , iv. 1, 2, 14 (bis).
нeтd mávtav к.т.入.] 'accompanied

Aboundye, according to my precepts. God's will is your sanctification, wherefore be chaste and wherefore

Аоит̀̀ ờv, àdèфоi, $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ IV.

with all His Saints;' not oivy but $\mu \epsilon \tau a$; they are here represented not so much as united with Him as attending on Him and sweling the majesty of His train; comp. notes on Eph. vi. 23, and contrast Col. iii. 4, where on the contrary the context shows that the idea is mainly that of colerence. It is very doubtful whether ol äroc are, with Pearson (Creed, Vol. II. p. 296), to be referred to the Holy Angels (see 2 Thess. i. 7 , Matth. xvi. $\mathbf{2 7}^{7}$, xxv. 3r, al.; comp. Heb. Psalm lxxxix. 6, Zech. xiv. 5 , al.), or, with Hofmann (Schriftb. Vol. II. 2, p. 595), to the Saints in their more inclusive sense (see ch. iv. 14, comp. i Cor. vi. 2) : perhaps the addition ad́vzes may justify us in referring the term to both; so Beng., Alf. The ${ }^{\mu} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ at the end of the verse [inserted by $\mathrm{AD}^{1} \mathrm{EN}^{1}$; mss. ; Clarom., Sang., Vulg., and by Lachm. in brackets] seems to be a liturgical addition.

Chapter IV. i. Molmèv oûv] 'Furthermore then,' in consequence of, and in accordance with the issue prayed for in the preceding verse; the ov having here its collective force, and introducing an appeal to the Thessalonians on their side, grounded on what the Apostle had asked in prayer for them from God; they were to do their part, Olsh. On the two uses of ouv (the collective and reflexive), see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 717, compared with Hartung, Partik. Vol. Ir. p. 9. The transl. of Vulg., 'ergo' (Clarom. less correctly 'autem'), is judiciously altered by Beza to 'igitur;' the former being properly used only 'in graviore argumentatione,' Hand, Tursell. Vol. inl. p. 187. The exact meaning of $\lambda_{o \iota \pi} \delta \nu$ has been somewhat
contested. By observing its use (2 Cor. xiii. ri) and that of the more
 iii. 1 , iv. 8, 2 Thess. iii. 1) in St Paul's Epp., we see that it is neither simply temporal (dácl $\mu \grave{̀} \nu$ кal $\epsilon i s ~ \tau \grave{~}$ $\delta \iota \eta \nu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \in$, Chrys., Theoph.), nor simply
 rather marks the transition to the close of the Ep. and to what remains yet to be'said ('de cætero,' Vulg.), whether much (Phil. iii. i) or little ( 2 Cor. xiii. II); $\tau \delta$ tis $\pi a \rho a l \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\nu}$, Ecum. 1: comp. notes on Phil. iii. . . The omission of $\tau \delta$ (inserted by Rec.) is here supported by all MSS. except $\mathrm{B}^{2}$ [mss. ; Chrys., Theod.], and acquiesced in by Lachm., Tisch., and appy. all modern editors: that of oúy [omitted by $\mathrm{B}^{1}$; 10 inss.; Syr., Copt. ; Cbrys.], though approved by Mill (Prolegom. p. xcv) and Tisch. ed. I , is on the contrary by no means probable. $\quad \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \mu \tau v]$ ' * $\omega e$ beseech;' comp. ch. v. 12, Phil. iv. 3, 2 Thess. ii. I, where alone it is used by St Paul: a derivative and non-classical use of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$, perhaps suggested by the double use of of which in the LXX it is not uncommonly a translation; see Psaln
 $\epsilon l \rho \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \nu \tau \grave{\eta}{ }^{\prime}$ 'Iє $\rho о v \sigma a \lambda \eta \mu$.
тарака入ои̃нєv і̀ Kup. 'I $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma$.] 'exhort you in the Lord Jesus;' our пapák $\eta$ ots is in Him alone (see Phil. ii. r, and notes); He is the sphere and element in which alone all we say and do has its proper existence and efficacy: see notes on Eph. iv. r7, vi. ı. The gloss $\delta \iota a ̀ \tau o \hat{\theta} \Theta \epsilon 0 \hat{\text {, Chrys. }}$ ( $\tau \delta \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\partial} \nu \pi a \rho a-$ $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \epsilon$, Theoph., 'per Cbristum rogat et obsecrat,' Schott 2), involves a needless departure from the almost regular meaning of this significant




formula：all the ancient Vv．retain the simple and primary meaning of the preposition．
qua käós к．т．入．］＇that even as ye received from us；＇subject of the prayer blended with the purpose of making it，intro－ duced by the partially final lva；see notes on Eph．i．I7．On the meaning of $\pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ，here unduly extended by Chrys．，Theoph．，to the teaching of examples（ovं $\chi^{i} \dot{\rho} \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \mu \delta \nu o \nu$ ध́ $\sigma \tau<\nu$ $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{a}$ каi $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha}(\omega \nu)$ ，see notes on ch． ii．13．This iva is omitted by Rec． with $\mathrm{AD}^{3} \mathbf{E}^{2} \mathrm{KLN}$ ；great majority of mss．；Syr．－Phil．，Ath．－Platt（appy．）； Chrys．，Theod．，al．（Tisch．ed．2）：but is rightly retained by Lachm．，Tisch． ed．7． C is deficient．
 walk；＇literally＇the how，dec．，＇the $\tau \delta$ giving to the whole clause a sub－ stantival character，and bringing the two members into a single point of view；comp．Luke ix．46，Rom．iv． 13，viii．26，see Winer，Gr．§ 20．3， p． 162 ，ed． 5 （omitted or placed else－ where in ed．6），Fritz．on Mark，p．372， Jelf，Gr．§457．3，and the numerous exx．in Matth．Gr．§ 280 ．
кal ápérкєьv $\Theta \in \hat{\varphi}]$＇and（by so doing） to please God．＇The кal does not seem to be either explanatory（Schott 2）or Hebraistic（＇vinn consilii aut effectus describens，＇Storr，cited by Schott）， but with its not uncommon consecu－ tive force marks the d dpé $\kappa \in \epsilon \nu$ as the result of the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a r \epsilon i v ; ~ c o m p . ~ n o t e s ~$ on Phil．iv．12．The words кaө̀̀s кal $\pi \epsilon \rho t \pi a \tau \epsilon i ̂ \tau \epsilon$ are omitted by Rec．，Tisch． ed．2，but only on the authority of $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathbf{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$ ；most mss．；Syr．，Chrys．， Theod．，Dam．：they are rightly in－
serted by Lachm．，Tisch．ed．7，on greatly preponderant authority．We can hardly say that the words are in－ serted＇vitiose et parum ad rem＇ （Just．）；the terms of the concluding exhortation seem to render an allusion to their present state，if not necessary， yet certainly natural and appropriate． For a sound sermon on this text， see Beveridge，Serm．cxxilr．Vol．v． p． 347 sq ．
$\pi є \rho เ \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ บ́ $\tau \epsilon$ $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o v]$＇ye may abound still more，＇ scil．in your walking and pleasing God：the expression occurs again in ver．Io and Phil．i．9．The omission of a oürws corresponding to the first $\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} s$ ，and the conclusion of the sen－ tence in terms not wholly symmetrical with what had preceded，involve no real difficulty，and are characteristic of the Apostle＇s style．

2．ov\＆atє үáp］＇For ye know．＇ Appeal to the memory of the Thes－ salonians in confirmation of the fore－ going declaration кat̀̀s тape入áßete， ＇quasi dicat Accepisse vos a nobis dico，＇Est．；comp．I Cor．xv．1，2， Gal．iv．I3．Tivas тapayy．］ ＇what commands；＇not＇evangelii præ－ dicationem，＇Pelt，－but，in accordance with the regular meaning of the word and the tenor of the context，＇præ－ cepta，＇scil．＇bene sancteque vivendi，＇ Est．，＇vivendi regula，＇Calv．；comp． Acts v．28，xvi．24， 1 Tim．i．5，18， and see notes in locc．The emphasis， as Lünem．observes，rests on tivas，and prepares the reader for the following тойтo，ver． 3 ．$\delta$ เ̀̀ тov̂ Kvp．＇Iఇण．］＇by the Lord Jesus，＇＇per Dominum Jesum，＇Vulg．，Clarom．， ＇bairh，＇Goth．；not equivalent to $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$

## 

$\mathrm{K} v \rho(\omega$ (Pelt), but correctly designating the Lord as the 'causa medians'
 declared: they were not the Apostle's own commands, but Christ's (oúk є̇ц̀ $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho, \phi \eta \sigma l \nu, \dot{a} \pi a \rho \dot{\gamma} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda a, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon l \nu o v$ $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a$, Theoph.), by whose blessed influence he was moved to deliver them; comp. 2 Cor. i. 5, and see Winer, $A r$. § 47. i, p. 339 note 2. The addition does not then seem designed so much to vindicate the authority of the Apostle (Olsh.) as to enhance the importance of the commands; comp. I Cor. vii. ro.
3. тоûto үóp к.т. $\lambda$.] 'For this is the will of God,'-'this that follows, this that I am about to declare to you;' further explanation of the thas
 its explanatory (' quippe hæc,' Schotl) than its argumentative force; see notes on Gal. ii. 6. Toûto is obviously not the predicate ( $\mathrm{De}_{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{W}$.), but the subject, placed somewhat emphatically forward to echo the preceding thas and direct the reader's attention to the noun in apposition that follows. Lünem. and Alf. compare Rom. ix. 8, Gal. iii. 7; but the passages are not perfectly analogous, as there the demonstrative pronoun is retrospective, here mainly prospective; comp. notes
 'the will of God;' 'id quod Deus vult,' Fritz. Rom. Vol. III. p. 33. The omission of $\tau \dot{\partial}$ before $\theta \in \lambda$. [inserted by AFG, and by Lachm. in brackets] is not to be accounted for by the ' nondistribution of the predicate $\theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda . \tau 0 \hat{\imath}$ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ ' (Alf.; but with ?), nor because what follows does not exhaust the conception (Lünem.), but simply on the principle noticed by the Greek grammarians (Apollon. de Synt. I. 31, p. 64 , ed. Bekk.) that 'after verbs substantive
or nuncupative' the article is frequently omitted: see Middleton, $G r$. Art. 1II. 3. 2, p. 43 (ed. Rose), but observe that the rule is by no means so universal as Middl. seems to think ; see Winer, Gr. § i8. 7, p. 104. When the subject is a demonstrative pronoun and the verb is omitted (Rom. ix. 8), the exceptions are naturally fewer, as the insertion of the article might often leave it uncertain whether the demonstr. pronoun was intended to be predicative or no ; see Stallb. on Plato, Apol. p. I 8 a, and Engelhart on Plato, Lach. § i. It may be noticed that the useful and common form $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a$ is appy. confined to the LXX, N.T., and late writers; comp. Lobeck, Phryn. p. 7.
 tion;' appositional member to the preceding $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a \quad \tau o \hat{\theta} \quad \theta \in o \hat{v}$, further defined both negatively and positively in the following clauses, and more specially exemplified in the subsequent appositional member $\tau \delta \mu \grave{\eta}$ ún $\epsilon \rho \beta a l-$ $\nu \epsilon L \nu$, ver. 6. The late substantive ajca $\alpha \mu$ bs,-which, as the defining clauses seem to show, has here somewhat of a special meaning (Beng.), 一 is not equivalent to $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \sigma \sigma^{\prime} v \eta$ (comp. Olsh., Usteri, Lehrb. p. 226, note), but in accordance with its termination ('action of verb proceeding from subject,' Donalds. Cratyl. § 253) still retains its active force, $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ being a simple gen. objecti, 'sanctificatio vestri,' i.e. 'ut sanctitati studeatis,' Menoch. ap. Pol. Syn.; comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 47. 7. I sq., and see note on ch. iii. I3.
 ye abstain from formication;' explanatory infinitive, defining on the negative side the preceding term $\dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \dot{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{\gamma}$ a$\sigma \mu \delta s$, which otherwise must have been

## 

regarded as simply general in its signification; see Krüger, Sprachl. \& 57 . 10. 6 sq., Winer, Gr. §44. I, p. 284, and comp. Madvig, Synt. \& 153 , who however has not sufficiently illustrated this not uncommon use of the infinitive. Even Winer (Gr. \& 44. 2) seems to regard the inf. here as a subject-inf. in apposition to $\theta \in \lambda \eta \mu a$ rov̂ $\theta$ єồ (comp. too Syr., 不th.), but appy. with but little plausibility. The insertion (ch. v. 22) or omission (1 Tim. iv. 3) of $\dot{a} \pi \delta$ after the compound an $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \chi \in \sigma \theta a_{\iota}$ involves no real change of meaning (compare Acts xv. 20, 29), but differs at most only thus much,--'ut in priori formula [with a $\pi$ d $\delta$ ] sejunctionis cogitatio ad rem, in posteriore antem ad nos ipsos referatur,' Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 225 .
$\tau$ ins mopvelas]
' Fornication;' abstract, and perhaps here with a somewhat comprehensive meaning [F reads rafl $\tau \hat{\eta} s$, and 31
 Chrys., Theod., al substitute $\pi$ díg s for the art.], 'quicquid est rerum venerearum,' Calv., or more suitably to the present context 'omnem illicitum concubitum' (comp. Est.). It must be always remembered that the deadly sin of ropyeia in its usual and general sense ever formed the subject of special prohibition, as being one of those things which the Gentile world regarded as aidiá $\phi o \rho a$; see Meyer on Acts xy. 20.
 each one of you know how \&e.;' explanatory infinitive, parallel to $a \pi t-$ $\chi \in \sigma \theta a t$, defining on the positive side the preceding á $\gamma$ ta $\sigma \mu$ ós : so (as far as can be inferred from the collocation of words and form of expression), Copt., Goth., Arm., and Vulg. in spite of modern punctuation. Alford and others (comp. Clarom. 'abstinere
...ut sciat...ut nequis') regard the
 further specification of what immediately precedes; this however tends to obscure the distinction between the infinitival clauses with and without the article (see below on ver. 6), and exegetically considered has nothing particularly to recommend it. For a similar comprehensive force of eldéval,

 For $\ddot{\epsilon}_{\kappa \alpha \sigma \tau о \nu}$ AFG read $\xi_{\kappa \alpha \sigma \tau о 5, ~ s o ~}^{\text {s }}$ Lachm. in marg.
тò éavtoû okєv̂os kтâनtar] 'to get himself his own vessel:' so it would seem Syr., Copt. (e-chphof naf), Armen. (sdānäl);-but as in these and other languages the ideas of acquisition and possession are expressed by the same word, discrimination is not easy. The meaning of the clause, and especially of the word $\sigma \kappa \in \hat{v o s}$, has been much debated. Setting aside all arbitrary and untenable interpretations, we have two explanations of $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ éautô̂ бкє̂̀os; (a) 'his body;' бкєنेos $\tau \dot{\sigma} \sigma \hat{\mu} \mu \dot{d} \phi \sigma_{\iota} \nu$, Theoph., Ecum. ; во Chrys., Theod. (who notices and rejects the other expl.), Tertull. (de Resurr. 16), Ambrosiast., Olsh., and some modern commentators; (b) 'his
 ${ }^{2 v o \mu a} \zeta \epsilon \epsilon$, Thieod.-Mops., Augurt. contra Jul. Iv. $\Sigma^{6}[\mathrm{x}]$-or more generally (De W.) his lawful 'copartner and recipient' in fulfilling the divine ordinance (Gen. i. 28), with a reference to a similar use of the Heb. כְְ (see the pertinent example from Megill. Est. i. 11, 'vas meum que ego utor,' cited by Schoettg. Hor. Hebr. Vol. 1. p. $7^{27}$, and most commentators) and the generally appropriate nature of the trope (see Sohar Levit. xxxviii. 152, cited by Schoettg.) : so Aquin., Est., more
recently Schott, De W., and appy. the majority of modern expositors. - Of these two interpretations ( $a$ ) is plausible, but open, as Lünem. clearly states, to four objections,-(a) the inaccurate meaning 'possidere' (Vulg.) thus assigned to $\kappa \tau \hat{a} \sigma \theta a t$; ( $\beta$ ) the $a b-$ sence of any adj. (2 Cor. iv. 7) or defining gen. (Barnab. Epist. § 7, II) which might warrant such a meaning being assigned to $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \hat{0}$ s, -unsuccessfully evaded (Olsh.) by the assumption that éaviov practically $=\psi \omega \chi \hat{\eta} s$; $(\gamma)$ the emphatic position of éautou (comp. r Cor. vii. 2), which is hardly to be explained away as a mere equi: valent of a possess. pronoun; ( $\delta$ ) the context, which seems naturally to suggest, not a mere periphrasis of what had preceded, but a statement on the positive and permitted side antithetical to the prohibition on the negative. These objections are so strong that we can scarcely hesitate in adopting (b), towards which both lexical usage ( $\kappa$ âa $\sigma a \iota$ रuvaîka, Ecelus. xxxvi. 29 [24], Xen. Symp. II. io) and exegetical arguments very distinctly converge. While пор $\frac{1}{}$ a is prohibited on the negative side, chastity and holiness in respect of the primal ordinance are equaliy clearly inculcated on the positive. For further details see the elaborate notes of De W., Koch, and Lünem. in loc.
 кal $\tau[\mu \hat{\eta}]$ 'in sanctification and honour;' ethical element in which ro $\kappa \tau \hat{a} \sigma \theta a c$ was to take place: the union of man and woman was to be in sanctification and honour, not, as in the case of $\pi$ opvela, in sin and shame. Here, as the associated abstr. subst. suggests, $\dot{\alpha} / a \sigma \mu \hat{\varphi}$ passes from its act. into its neutral meaning; comp. notes on ch. iii. 13 .
 lustfulness of desire;' not in that sinful and morbid state (comp. Cicero, Tuse. Disp. III. 4. 10) in which $\epsilon^{\pi} \pi t$ $\theta v u^{\prime} a$ becomes the ruling and prevailing principle, and the кol $\eta$ ceases to be dulavtos (Heb. xiii. 4). On the meaning of $\pi$ ditos, see Trench, Synon. Part II. § 37, and notes on Col. iii. 5 . каӨáтєр каl тà êtvך] 'even as the Gentiles also;' the кal having here its comparative force, and instituting a comparison between the Gentiles and the class implied in the $\Psi_{\kappa}$ кабтov $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$; comp. ch. iii. 6, and see notes on Eph. v. 23 , where this usage is fully discussed. Alford cites Xen. Anab. Ir.
 кal $\beta$ aбi $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, but not with complete pertinence, as there the kal appears in both clauses, here only in the relative clause; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. ir. p. 635. The remark of Fritz. (Rom. Vol. I. p. $\mathrm{IH}_{4}$ ) on the preseuce or absence of the article with $\neq \theta \nu \eta$, 'ubi de paganis in universum loquitur articulum addit, ubi de gentilium parte agit eundem omittit,' is substantially correct, but must not be over-pressed; comp. I Cor. i. 23 (not Rec.).
тà $\mu$ ग̀ єl8óta т̀̀v ©єóv] 'which know not God;' who as a class are so characterized, the subjective negation $\mu \dot{\eta}$ being rightly used as being in harmony both with the oblique and infinitival character of the preceding clauses, and with the fact that the Gentiles are here not bistorically described as 'ignorantes Deum' (see notes on Gal. iv. 8) but only regarded as such by the writer; see Winer, Gr. $\S 55.5$, p. 428 sq. The article is here appropriately added to $\Theta \epsilon b \nu$, but this is one of the many words in the N.T. for which no precise rules can be
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laid down: see Winer, Gr. § 19. I, p. 1 io.
6. тò $\mu \grave{\eta} \boldsymbol{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta a i v e เ v]$ 'that no one go beyond,' 'that there be no going beyond,'-the subject-accus. not being $\ddot{\epsilon}_{\kappa a \sigma \tau o \nu}$ (Alf.), but $\tau \iota \nu a$ (comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 55.2.6) supplied from the following aürov, and suggested by the general character of the prohibition. The clause is thus not merely parallel to the anarthrous $\varepsilon l$ $\delta \epsilon v a l$ (Alf.), but reverts to the preceding $\dot{a} \gamma \mathrm{ta} \sigma \mu \delta \mathrm{s}$, of which it presents a specific exemplification (comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 50. 6. 3) more immediately suggested by the second part of ver. 4. First mopveia is prohibited; then a holy use of its natural remedy affirmatively inculcated; and lastly the heinous sin of $\mu o t \chi$ eia, especially as regarded in its social aspects, formally denounced. So rightly Chrys. (è
 $\kappa a i l \pi \in \rho l \pi \rho \rho \nu \epsilon$ las $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \zeta)$, and after him Theod., Theoph., Ecum., and the majority of modern commentators. To regard the verse with Calv., Grot., and recently De W., Lünem., Koch, as referring to fraud and covetousness in the general affairs of life, is (a) to infringe on the plain meaning of $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau l$, see below ; $(\beta)$ to obscure the ref. to the key-word of the paragraph $\dot{\alpha} \kappa a \theta a \rho \sigma i a$, ver. $7 ;(\gamma)$ to mar the contextual symmetry of the verses; and ( $\delta$ ) to introduce an exegesis so frigid and unnatural, as to make us wonder that such good names should be associated with an interpretation seemingly so improbable.
 yond and over-reach,' 'supergrediatur neque circumveniat,' Vulg., both words associated with the following accus., -and both of then significantly and appositely chosen. ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Y}_{\pi \epsilon \rho} \beta$ alvelv
(a ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi . \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N.T.) with an accus. personce properly signifies a 'passing beyond,' thence derivatively a 'leaving unnoticed,' whether simply (Isæus, p. 38. 6, and 43.34) or contemptuously (Plutarch, de A more Prol. § 3 ; comp. Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. 337), as appy. Æth. taahaja [extulit se], 一 with which perbaps in the present case there may be associated a reference to a $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon_{\rho} \beta a \sigma \iota s$ of another in respect of the öpoc appointed by God and by nature; see Chrys. and the Greek commentators, who however seem to have taken $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta a i v \epsilon l y$ absolutely; comp. Raphel, Annot. Vol. II. 542. Плєодєктєî with an accus. personce properly signifies ' lucri causâ fraudem facere alicui' (2 Cor. vii. 2, xii. 17,18 ), thence with a slightly more general reference 'circumvenire aliquem' (comp. 2 Cor. ii. II), 'bifaib(o),' Goth., the idea of selfish and self-seeking fraud rather than mere wrong or injury (comp. Syr., Copt., Arm.) being always involved in the word; see Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Vol. II. p. 746, and comp. Meyer on 2 Cor. vii. 2.
 Copt. (definitely expressing the art.), and similarly, but too strongly, Syr. lôong lị̃o [in hoc negotio], -not exactly $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \ell \xi \varepsilon$, Theoph., Eccum., but more generally, in the matter of which we are now speaking (comp. 2 Cor. vii. II), which however obviously involves reference to deeds of carnality and adultery ; see Middleton, Gr. Art. p. 377 (ed. Rose), Green, Gram. p. 156. To regard $\mathrm{T} \Omega$ as enclitic (Auth., Koppe) is contrary to the usage of the N.T.; and to as-
 $\mu a \sigma \iota v$ (De W., comp. Winer, Gr. §ıs. 8, p. 105), or that it can imply 'the



business in question' (Lünem.) when nothing has preceded sufficient to mark what the $\pi \rho \hat{\rho} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu} a$ really is, must respectively on grammatical and logical grounds be pronounced wholly unten-
 brother,'-not merely 'his neighbour' (Schott), but 'his Christian brother,' him whom so to wrong and defraud is doubly flagitious; $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \grave{\nu} \nu$ кал $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$

 Lord is the avenger;' ovidè $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ àtı $\mu \omega$ $\rho \eta \tau i \tau a \hat{v} \tau a \pi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \xi_{0} \mu \epsilon \nu$, Chrys.; see Eph. v. 6 , Col. iii. 6 , where similar prohibitions are accompanied by a similar warning reason. The term ékסıкos, a $\delta i s \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N.T. (here and Rom. xiii. 4), primarily denotes $\tau \partial े \nu \xi \xi \omega \tau 0 \hat{v}$ סıkalou övta (Suid. s.v., Zonar. Lex. p. 65 r), 'lawless,' 'unjust' (comp. Soph. Edd. Col. 917); thence in later writers it passes over to the meaning of 'an avenger;' comp. Suid. s.v. 'T $\beta$ uкоs (iঠє ai ' $\mathrm{I} \beta$ и́кои $̈ к \delta \iota к о \iota$ ), Wisdom xii. I2, Ecclus. xxx. 6. On the still later use in eccl. writers to denote 'Defensores' or 'Syndics' of the church, see Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Vol. I. p. 1045, Bingham, Antiq. III. II. 5 . On stótı, comp. note and reff. on ch. ii. 8. Rec. reads $\dot{\text { o }}$ Kúp., but the article is rightly omitted by Lachm., Tisch.,
 rov́r $\omega v]$ 'concerning, in the matter of, all these things,'-not merely cases of $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta a \sigma i a$ and $\pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu \epsilon \xi i a$ (Alf.), but, as the comprehensive expression seems to require, all the sins of the flesh previously mentioned; see Chrys., Theoph., Ecum., who from the inclusive nature of their language seem to adopt the latter view. As illustrative
of the use of $\notin \kappa \delta \kappa \kappa о$ with $\pi \epsilon \rho i$, comp.

 'as also we before told you and solemnly testified;' the first кal being comparative and associated with $\kappa a \theta \dot{\omega} s$ (see on ver. 5), the second simply copulative. The $\pi \rho \delta$ appears merely to point to a time prior to the $\hat{\epsilon} \delta \delta i \kappa \eta \sigma \iota s$ taking place: comp. Gal. v. 21, and notes in loc. On the stronger and more emphatic ঠea $\mu \rho \tau \dot{u} \rho$. (not simply $=\mu a \rho \tau \dot{u} \rho o \mu a$, Olsh.), see notes on I Tim. v. 21, and
 here -o $\mu \in \nu$, with AKL; most mss.; Cbrys., Theod.], comp. Winer, $G r$. § 15, p. 78 . In the N.T. the ist aor. form seems to prevail in the and person (Matth. xxvi. 25, 64, Mark xii. 32, Luke xx. 39, John iv. 17), the 2nd aor. forms in the other persons, but in the latter instances, esp. in the case of the 3 rd pers. plural, there is much difference of reading.
7. ou่ үáp к.т.入.] 'For God called us not;' confirmation of the preceding statement $\delta \iota \sigma \tau \iota \notin \kappa \delta i \kappa o s$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., derived from the object contemplated in the $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau s$. On the act of calling, scil.
 ii. 12), as specially attributed to God the Father, see notes on Gal. i. 6 .
ìml áka日apolą] 'for uncleanness;' object or purpose for which they were (not) called, the primary meaning of the prep. ('nearness or approximation,' Donalds. Crat. § i 72 ) not being wholly obliterated; see Gal. v. Is; Krüger, Sprachl. §68. 41. 7, Jelf, Gr. $\S 634 \cdot 3$, Winer, $G r . \S 48$. c, p. 35 I, and exx. in Raphel, Annot. Vol. II. p. 546. iv $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{~} \boldsymbol{y}\llcorner a \sigma \mu \bar{\psi}]$ ' in sanctification;' not 'in sanctificationem,' Vulg., but ' in sanc-


tificatione,' Clarom., Vulg. (Amiat.); $\boldsymbol{z}_{\nu}$ being neither equivalent to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon l s}$ (Pisc.), not yet used brachylogically, scil. ©̈are єivaı $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s{ }_{c} \epsilon_{\nu}$ (Winer, Gr. $\S 50.5$, p. 370 ), but simply marking the sphere in which Christians were called to move; see notes on Gal. i. 6, on Eph. iv. 4, and compare Green, Gr. p. 292.
 it here retains its active meaning.
8. тoเүapô̂v] 'Wherefore then;' logical conclusion from the preceding verse. The compound particle rocrapouv (only found here and Heb. xii. I) is not simply synonymous with rot$\gamma$ dip ot (Hartung, Partik. s.v. Tol, 3. 5, Vol. 1. p. 354), but while differing from the simpler $\tau 0 c \gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ ' hâc de causâ igitur' (Klotz) in imparting a more syllogistic and ratiocinative character to the sentence, differs also from rotरáprol 'qua propter sane' in having not an affirmative ( $\tau 0 i$ ) but a collective and retrospective (oviv) force; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. iI. p. 738.
o diter $\omega \mathrm{v}]$ ' 'the despiser,' 'the rejecter;' substantival use of the present participle ; see Winer, Gr. § 45. 7, p. 316, and Middleton, Gr. Art. p. I 59. Any definite insertions after $\dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, e.g. Vulg. 'haec,' Arm. i $\mu \mathrm{â}$, Beza 'hæc, scil. præcepta,' are wholly unnecessary. It is clear that the commands recently given must form the objects of the $\dot{\alpha} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \eta \eta \sigma t s$; these however the Apostle does not specify, his object being to call attention not so much to what is set at naught as to the person who sets at naught, and the personal risk that he incurs. On the verb $\dot{a} \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, used in the N. T. both with persons (Mark vi. 26, Luke x. 16, Joln xii. 48) and things (Mark vii. 9, Gal. iii. 15, al.), comp. notes on Gal. ii. 2 I. จข่к ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ оข к.т. $\left.\lambda.\right]$
'rejecteth not man but God,' not one whom it might be thought in some degree excusable to despise-but $\tau \grave{y}$ Ө́óv. The antithesis oúк...d $\lambda \lambda d \dot{\alpha}$ is thus not to be explained away, 'non tam hominem......quam Deum,' Est., but retained with its usual and proper force, 'non hominem......sed deum,' Vulg.; see esp. Winer, Gr. § 55. 8, p. 439 sq ., and notes on Eph. vi. 12 . On the exact difference between this formula ('ubi prior notio tota tollitur, et in ejus locum posterior notio substituitur'), óv $\mu$ óvo $\ldots \ldots \dot{a} \lambda \lambda a ́$, and oủ $\mu o ́ v o \nu$ ...à $\lambda \lambda$ à $\kappa \alpha l$, see Kühner on Xen. Mem. I. 6. 2, comp. also notes on ch. i. 8. The omission of the article before ávepetov, 'a man,' 'any man,'-with a latent reference to the Apostle, not to $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu \epsilon \kappa \tau \eta \theta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a$ (Ecum.),-and its insertion [it is however omitted by $\mathbf{D}^{1} \mathbf{F G}$ ] before ${ }^{\text {Éćn }}$ (almost 'ipsum Deum'), though not capable of being conveyed in translation, must not be overlooked.
 ' who also gave;' who in addition to having called us $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma t a \sigma \mu \hat{\psi}$ has also been pleased to furnish us with the blessed means of realizing it; comp. Reuss, Théol. Chrêt. Iv. 55 , Vol. II. p. 150 . The only difficulty is the reading: кal is omitted by Lachm. with $\mathrm{ABD}^{3} \mathrm{E}$; 10 mss.; Clarom., Sangerm., Syr., Goth., al.; Athan., Did., Chrys., Theod. (ms.), Theoph., al.,but, as the insertion is well supported [DTFGKLN; most mss.; Augiens., Boern., Vulg., Syr.-Pliil., al.; Clem., Theod., Dam., Ecum.], and far less easy to he accounted for than the omission, we retain kai with Rec., Tisch., Alf., and the bulk of recent editors. It is much more difficult to decide between סóvra [Rec., Lachm. in marg., Tisch., with AKLN ${ }^{4}$; mostmss.;

On brotherly love I need say nothing. I beseech you to be quiet, industrious, and orderly.


appy. all Vv.; Clem., Chrys., Theod.] and $\delta \iota \delta \delta \dot{\nu} \tau a$ [Lachm. text, with BDE FGN ${ }^{1}$; 10 mss.; Ath., Did.]. The latter deserves great consideration as baving such very strong uncial authority, still as the $V \mathrm{~V}$. appear all to favour the aorist, and as it also certainly does seem probable that the correction might have arisen from a desire to represent that the gift of the Spirit was still going on (comp. Luke xi. I3), we retain $\delta \delta \nu \tau a$.
 great emphasis and solemnity (comp. Eph. iv. 30),--'His Holy Spirit,' the blessed Spirit which proceeds from Him (see notes on Phil. i. 19), whose attribute is holiness, and whose office especially 'consists in the sanctifying of the servants of God,' Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 387 (ed. Burt.). To dilute this distinct personal expression into 'the gift of spiritual insight, dec.' (Olsh.), is by no means satisfactory; see notes on Gal. iv. 6.
cls ìpass] 'unto you;' not merely equivalent to a transmissive dative, nor yet with any idea of diffusion (Alf., see notes on ch. ii. 9), but, with the usual and proper meaning of local direction, 'in vos,' Clarom., Copt. (ekhrei): they were the objects to whom that blessed gift was directed; comp. Gal. iv. 6. The reading of Rec. $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ has but weak external support [A; some mss.; Augiens., Vulg., Syr.Phil., Æth. (Pol., but not Platt); Chrys., al.), and on internal grounds is not free from some suspicion.
9. Пєр\ 8 \& к.т.入.] 'Now concerning \&c.;' transition by means of the $8 \boldsymbol{k}$ $\mu \epsilon \tau а \beta a \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu$ to a fresh exhortation. On this force of $\delta \ell$, see notes on Gal. iii. 8.
 to their fellow-Christians; Rom. xii.

10, Heb. xiii. I, r Pet. i. 22, 2 Pet. i. 7, comp. I Pet. iii. 8. This love was to be no passive virtue, but, as verse to suggests, was to display itself in acts of liberality and benevolence towards their poorer and suffering brethren: so Theod., though perhaps a little too definitely, $\phi i \lambda a \delta \in \lambda \phi l a v \quad \epsilon \nu-$ $\tau \alpha \hat{\theta} \theta \alpha \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu d \tau \omega \nu \quad \phi i \lambda о \tau<\mu l a \nu$ $\epsilon \in \kappa \dot{d} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$. It is unnecessary to exclude wholly a reference to a love eis $\pi d \boldsymbol{d} \tau a s$ (Theoph.) : the Christian $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi 0 l$ were the primary objects (comp. 2 Pet. i. 7 , where $\phi \downarrow \lambda a \delta \in \lambda \phi l a$ is distinguished from, and precedes the general $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{d} \pi \eta$ ), but the great brotherhood of mankind was still not to be forgotten; comp. Gal. vi. io. ou Xpeiav EXє íniv] 'ye have no need that I write to you;' rhetorical turn, technically termed 'præteritio,' or $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon \psi \iota s$, in which what might be said is partly suppressed, to conciliate a more loving acceptance of the implied command; катд̀ $\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \iota \nu \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \pi a \rho a i \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu \tau l-$





 val, Theoph. On this rhetorical form, see notes on Philem. ig, and Wilke, N. T. Rhetorik, p. 365. The reading is doubtful: Lachm. adopts éx ${ }^{\circ} \mu \in \nu$ with $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FG} \mathrm{N}^{4}$ [B; Vulg. (Amiat.) give $\left.\epsilon^{\prime} \chi \quad \mu \epsilon \nu\right]$; 6 mss. ; Vulg., Clarom., Goth., Syr.-Phil.; Chrys., Theoph., but though the external authority for the first person is strong, yet the probability of a correction to obviate the difficulty of construction is very great. $\quad$ Ypáфєєv] 'that I write.' The object-inf. has here practically the sense of a passive (comp. ch. v. 1),



but differs from it in suggesting the supplement of some accusative,- 'that I or any one should write to you;' see Winer, Gr. § 44. 8, note 1, p. 303, Jelf, Gr. § 667 . obs. 3. To deny this on the ground that the context pracludes an indefinite reference, and practically limits the supplied accus. to the Apostle (Lünem.), seems distinctly hypercritical. aitol yd̀ ínîs] 'for you yourselves;' not 'vos ipsi sponte,' Schott, but 'yourselves,' -in sharp contrast to the subject involved in the infinitive; comp. I John ii. 20.
$\theta \in \circ \delta \delta$ ®aктоl] ' $^{\text {taught }}$ of God,'-not in marked opposition to any other form of teaching (ovi $\delta \in i ̄ \sigma \theta \epsilon$,
 comp. Olsh.), but with the principal emphasis on the fact of their being already taught, and with only a subordinate emphasis on the source of the teaching. The chief moment of thought, as Linem. well observes, rests on the second and not on the first half of the compound verbal $\theta$ өoolisaктo. The form itself is a ä a $\alpha \xi \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N.T.; comp. however John vi. 45, $\delta \delta \delta a \kappa \tau o i \theta \epsilon \circ \hat{v}$, and add Barnab. Epist.


eis tò à $\mathfrak{a} a \pi a ̂ v$ á $\lambda \lambda \eta$ j̀ $\lambda o v s]$ 'to love one another,' 'ut diligatis invicem,' Vulg.; practical tendency and purpose of the $\delta \delta \delta a \chi \dot{\eta}$, with perhaps an included reference to the purport and subject of it; see notes on ch. ii. 12 .
ı. каl үáp к.т. $\lambda$.$] 'for indeed ye$ do it,' confirmatory explanation of the preceding clause; $\gamma \mathrm{a} \rho$ introducing the historical fact on which the confirmation rested (oìa à $\phi^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \nu$ noteîte, Theoph.), кal enhancing the moteite,
and putting it in gentle contrast with the $\theta \epsilon \sigma \delta \delta \delta a \kappa \tau 0 l$ éart. Thus neither the кal nor the $\gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ (Syr., Ath.-Pol., -but not Syr.-Phil. and Eth.-Platt) is otiose: both fully retain their proper force (Copt., Goth., Arm.), their association being due to the early position which $\gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ regularly assumes in the sentence; see notes and reff. on Phil. ii. 27, and comp. Winer, Gr. § 53. 8. b, p. 397. aúто́] 'it,' scil. $\tau \boldsymbol{\delta}$ á $\gamma a \pi a ̀ \nu \dot{a} \lambda \lambda$ भ̂גous (Luinem., Alf.), not $\tau \delta \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \phi \lambda a \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi l a s\left(K_{o c h}\right)$,-a reference needlessly remote.
eis mávtas tov̀s aide $\lambda$ 中.] 'toward all the brethren;' direction and destination of the action; not, observe, with any marked universality, els mávtas toùs
 $\overline{\epsilon \nu} \partial \ddot{\partial} \lambda \eta \tau \hat{g}$ Maкє $\delta$., the last definition fairly justifying the remark of Lünem. (opp. to Baur, Paulus, p. 484) that there is no reason for assuming any longer period between the conversion of the Thessalonians and the time of writing the Epistle ( $1 \frac{1}{2}$ or 2 years) than is assumed in the ordinary ehronology. The arguments of Baur, according to which this beautiful and most genuine Ep. is to be considered as a 'matte Nachbild' of I Cor., have been recently reiterated in Zeller, Theol. Jahrb. for $\mathrm{I}_{555}$, p. ${ }_{5} \mathrm{I}$, but it is not too much to say that they lack even plausibility. The second and definitive rois (Winer, Gr.§ 20. I, p. 119) is omitted by Lachm. with $\mathrm{AD}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$; Chrys. (ms.), but appy. rightly retained by Tisch. with BD $^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathbf{E K}$ $\mathrm{LN}^{4}$; all mss.; many Ff. : $\boldsymbol{N}^{1}$ reads


тарака入оиิрєv ठè $\left.\hat{u}^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}\right]$ 'but we exhort you;' continuation of the implied command in


ver. 9 in a slightly antithetical form; not only is the duty of $\phi i \lambda a \delta \in \lambda \phi i \alpha$ tacitly and delicately inculcated, and an expansion of it in the form of general $d \pi d \gamma \eta$ (ver. 9) distinctly suggested, but further an increase in the same is set forth as the subject of direct hortatory entreaty. On the pres. infin. after $\pi a \rho a \kappa a \lambda \omega$, which is here rightly used as marking the continuance and permanence of the act, see Winer, Gr. § 44. 7, p. 297, but observe that the use of the pres. inf. or aor. inf. after commands, \&ec., depends much on the habit of the writer, and on the subjective aspects under which the command was contemplated; comp. Bernhardy, Synt. x. 9, p. $3^{8} 3$, and the good note and distinctions of Mätzner on Antiphon, p. 153 sq.
$\pi \in \rho เ \sigma \sigma . \mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda_{0}$ ] Comp. ver. I, Phil. i. 9 .
11. каl к.т.ג.] 'and \&c.;' exhortation in close grammatical though somewhat inore lax logical connexion with what immediately precedes. The close union of these appy. different subjects of exhortation has been variously explained. On the whole it seems most natural to suppose that their liberality involved some elements of a restless, meddling, and practically idle spirit, that exposed them to the comments of oi $\xi \xi \omega$. It is perhaps not wholly improbable that mistaken expectations in respect of the day of the Lord had led them into a neglect of their regular duties and occupations, and was marring a liberality of which the true essence was $\epsilon_{\rho} \rho \gamma a \zeta \delta \mu \varepsilon v o r ~ \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon$ pous $\pi$ apt $\chi \in l \nu$, Chrys.
 your aim to be quiet,' 'et operam detis ut quieti sitis,' Vulg. (sim. Clarom.), 'biarbaidjan anaqaal,' Goth. It is some-
what doubtful whether ( $a$ ) the primary meaning of $\phi i \lambda o \tau \mu \mu$. with infin., 'gloriæ cupiditate accensus aliquid facere' (compare Copt., Ath.-Pol.), or (b) the secondary meaning, ' magno studio anniti,' 'operam dare' (Vulg., Clarom, Syr., Goth., Arm.), is here to be adopted. As both meanings rest on good lexical authority (comp. Xen. Mem. II. 9. 3, with Acon. Iv. 24, in which latter passage $\phi \iota \lambda o \tau \iota \mu \varepsilon i \sigma \theta a i \tau \iota$ is associated with $\mu \in \lambda \epsilon \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$ ), the context will be our safest guide. Of the three passages in which it is used in the N. T., Rom. xv. 20, 2 Cor. v. 9, and here, the first alone seems to require (a); comp. Fritz. Rom. l. c. Vol. HII. p. 277 , and even Meyer, on 2 Cor. l.c., who, while affecting to retain (a), translates in accordance with (b) 'beeifern wir uns u.s.w.' In all perhaps some idea of $\tau \iota \mu \grave{\eta}$ may be recognised, but in 2 Cor. l.c. and here that meaning recedes into the background; see the numerous exx. in Wetst. Vol. II. p. 94, 95, and Kypke, Obs. Vol. ir. p. ${ }^{889}$. To consider $\phi$ l $\lambda o \tau$. an independent inf. (Copt., Theoph. 1; comp. Theod., Calv.) seems to be very unsatisfactory. $\quad$ ívuxábevv marks the sedate and tranquil spirit (comp. I Tim. ii. 2) which stands in contrast to the excited and unquiet bustle ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \rho \rho \gamma^{\prime} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a u, 2$ Thess. iii. iI) that often marks ill-defined or mistaken religious expectation; see esp. 2 Thess. l.c. which forms an instructive parallel to the present exhortations.
$\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota v$ rạ̀ $र \delta \iota a]$ 'to do your own business,' 'to confine yourselves to the sphere of your own proper daties.' The correct formula according to Phrynichus is $\tau \grave{a}$ दे $\mu a v \tau o \hat{0} \ldots \pi \rho \dot{a} \tau \tau \epsilon \omega$, , or $\tau \grave{a}$
 lected by Lobeck, p. 44I, and Kypke,

#   <br>  not anticipate them, but at the last trump they will be raised, and we translated. 

Obs. Vol. II. p. 338. The form 1 dio$\pi \rho a \gamma \epsilon i v$ occurs in Polyb. Hist. vili. 28. 9, and later writers.
tpyál. тaîs Xєpoiv $\dot{\mathrm{v} \mu} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}]$ ] to work with your hands,' i.e. 'follow your earthly callings,' which, as the words imply, were those of handicraftsmen and artificers; 'ad populum scribit, in quo plurimorum est ea quæ manibus fiunt opera exercere,' Est. The numbers engaged in mercantile and industrial callings at Thessalonica are alluded to by Tafel, Hist. Thessal. p. 9. The inserted lifass [Rec. with $\mathrm{AD}^{3} \mathrm{KLN}^{1}$; most mss.; Theod., Dam.] after taîs is rightly struck out by Lachm., Tisch., and most modern editors, on the preponderant authority of $\mathbf{B D}^{1} \mathrm{E}(?) \mathbf{F G} \mathbf{N}^{4}$; 10 mss . ; appy. all Vv.; Bas., Cbrys., Theoph., and Latin Ff. ka日ws $\mathbf{v} \mu \mathrm{iv}$
тар $\eta \gamma \gamma$.] 'according as we commanded you,' scil. when personally present with you; with reference not merely to the last, but to all the preceding clauses. The very first publication of Christianity in Thessalonica seems to have been attended with some manifestations of restlessness and feverish expectation.
 order that ye may walk seemly,' Rom. xiii. 13, cf. I Cor. xiv. 40; purpuse of the foregoing $\pi a \rho a k \lambda \eta \sigma t s$, the present member referring mainly to $\dot{\eta} \sigma u \chi \alpha \dot{\zeta} \xi \omega$ кai $\pi \rho \alpha \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \tau d$ tola, the following to
 $\epsilon \dot{u} \sigma \chi \eta \mu$. (associated with катd $\tau \dot{\alpha} \xi(\nu$ I Cor. l.c.) stands in partial contrast
 the general idea however of that decent gravity and seemly deportment ( $\epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda a-$ $\beta \omega \hat{s} \cdot \sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \omega \bar{s}$, Zonar. s.v.), which should
ever be the characteristic of the true Christian, ought not to be excluded. On the use of $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon i v$ as commonly implying the 'agendi vivendique rationem quam quis continentur et ex animo sequitur,' see Winer, Comment. on Eph. iv. I, p. 5 (cited by Koch), Fritz. Rom. xiii. I3, Vol. III. p. 140 sq., Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. ir. p. 679 , and comp, notes on Phil. iii. i8. $\pi \rho d s$ rovs $\left.{ }^{*} \xi \omega\right]$ ' toward them that are without;' $\pi \rho \delta$ s pointing to the social relation in which they were to stand, or the general demeanour they were to assume, toward those who were not Christians. On this use of $\pi \rho \delta s$, in which the primary meaning of ethical direction is still appareat, see reff. in notes on Col. iv. 5 , where the same expression occurs. Ol $\not \xi \omega$ is the regular designation of those who were not Christians; see I Cor v. I2, I3, Col. l.c., and notes on I Tim. iii. 7 .
 man;' the contrast being $\dot{\epsilon \pi a \iota \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu}}$ кai $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$ סєīt $\theta a t$, Chrys., comp. Theod. It is somewhat doubtful whether $\mu \eta$ $\delta \epsilon \nu o ̀ s$ is here to be regarded as masc. with Syr., Vulg. (appy.), Ath., and the Greek commentators, or neuter with Copt. (appy.; Goth., Clarom. uncertain) and several modern commentators. On the whole the masc. seems most in accordance with the context; they were not by the neglect of their proper occupations to live dependent upon others, whether heathens or more probably fellow-Christians; comp. Chrys., Theod. The argument of Lünem. repeated by Alf., that 'to stand in need of no man is for man an impossibility,' is not of much weight,

13. коц $\mu \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \omega v$ ] So Lachm., Tisch. ed. 2, with $\mathrm{AB}_{\boldsymbol{\aleph}}{ }^{1}$; 10 mss . In ed. 7 however Tisch. has returned to the reading of Rec. кєкоч $\mu \eta \mu t \nu \omega \nu$, which has the support of $\mathrm{DE}(\mathrm{FG}$ кєкоц $\mu \eta \nu \nu) \mathrm{KL}$; most inss. C is deficient. As the present part. is not used elsewhere in this sense it is certainly to be retained here.
$\left.\lambda u \pi \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta_{\epsilon}\right]$ So Lachm. (text), Tisch. ed. 2, with BD ${ }^{3}$ EKN ; most mss.; many Ff. : here also Tisch. ed. 7 , has departed from his former reading and with Lachm. in marg. reads $\lambda u \pi \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta \epsilon$, on the authority of $\mathrm{AD}^{1} \mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{FGL}$; many mss. The weight of evidence is hardly sufficient to justify us in adopting here the harsh and unusual construction.
as the general statement will naturally receive its proper limitations from the context.
 would not have you to be ignorant:' transition by means of the $\delta \boldsymbol{\ell} \boldsymbol{\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta a -}$ $\tau<\kappa \delta \nu$ (Hartung, Partik. Vol. I. p. I65, notes on Gal. iii. 8), and the impressive
 xi. 25, I Cor. x. 1, xii. I, 2 (Cor. i. 8) to a new and important subject, the state of the departed. Most modern expositors seem rightly to coincide in the opinion that in the infant Church of Thessalonica there had prevailed, appy. from the very first, a feverish anxiety about the state of those who had departed, and about the time and circumstances of the Lord's coming. They seem especially to have feared that those of their brethren who had fallen on sleep before the expected advent of the Lord would not participate in its blessings and glories (ver. 15). Thus their apprehensions did not so much relate to the resurrection generally (Chrys., Theod., Theoph.), as to the share which the departed were to have in the $\pi \alpha \rho o v \sigma i a ~ \tau 0 \hat{v} \mathrm{Kv}$ plov; see Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 2, p. 596, comp. Wieseler, Chronol. p. 249. The reading $\theta$ é $\lambda о \mu \epsilon \nu$ has the support of all MSS.; nearly all mss.; all Vv. except Copt., Syr. (both), and most Ff., and is rightly adopted by Lachm., Tisch., and all
modern editors; Rec. gives $\theta e ́ \lambda \omega$. $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathfrak{\top} \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{v}$ коц $\mu \omega \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{v} \omega \boldsymbol{v}]$ 'concerning those that are sleeping;' i. e. those that are dead, according to the significant expression found not only in Scripture (1 Kings ii. 10, John xi. 1I, Acts vii. 60, 1 Cor. xi. 30, al.) but in Pagan writers (Callim. Fragm. x. I), yet here, as the following verses clearly show, to be specially restricted to the Chris-
 ver. 16 , and see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. II. p. 12 I . All special doctrinal deductions however from this general term (Weizel, Stud. u. Krit. 1836, p. $9{ }^{16}$ sq., comp. Reuss, Théol. Chrét. IV. 21, Vol. II. p. 239) must be regarded as extremely precarious, especially those that favour the idea of a $\psi v \chi 0$ ravpuxia in the intermediate state; see esp. Bull, Serm. III. p. 4i (Oxf. 1844), Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. vi. 4, p. $360 \mathrm{kq} .$, Zeller, Theol. Jahrb. for 1847, p. 390-409, and a long and careful article by West, Stud. u. Krit. for 1858 , esp. p. 278 , 290 ; comp. also Burnet, State of Departed, ch. III. p. 49 sq. (Transl.), and notes on Phil. i. 23. Death is rightly called sleep as involving the ideas of continued existence (Chrys.), repose, and $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \gamma \rho \sigma \sigma$ (Theod.) ; comp. Theoph. on John xi. II, and the eloquent sermon of Manning, Serm. xxi. Vol. I. p. 308 sq.
 purpose and object of the ov $\theta \in \lambda o \mu \epsilon \nu$

#   

$\dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s a \gamma \nu o \epsilon \hat{v}$ ．The $\lambda \dot{\prime} \pi \eta$ in this parti－ cular case was called out not merely by the feeling of having lost their de－ parted brethren，but by anxiety in re－ gard to their participation in Christ＇s advent．кa日ஸ̀s kal oi 入oırol］ ＇even as the rest also，＇scil．$\lambda u \pi o u ̂ v \tau a u$ ． The кä $\omega$ s［for which $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FGN}^{4}$ here give $\dot{\omega}$ ］does not introduce any com－ parison between the sorrow of Chris－ tians and that of oi $\lambda o c \pi o l$ ，as if a cer－ tain amount of sorrow was permissible （ov̉ $\pi a \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega s} \kappa \omega \lambda \hat{v} \epsilon \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \lambda \dot{u} \pi \eta \nu$ à $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \rho i a \nu$ éк $\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota$ ，Theod．），but simply contrasts with Christians those in whom $\lambda \dot{\prime} \pi \eta$ might naturally find a
 as the antithesis implies，were not to

 oi גoוтol（Eph．ii．3）obviously includes all，whether sceptical Jews or unen－ lightened heathen（Chrys．），who had no sure hope in any future resurrec－ tion．On the use of kal with adverbs of comparison，see notes on Eph．จ． 23 ． of $\mu{ }^{\mu}$＂Xovtes i $\lambda \pi(\delta a]$＇who have no hope，＇who form a class（ $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ）that is so characterized；comp．notes on ver．5， and Winer，Gr．§ 55．5，p． 428 sq．，but observe also that the comparative member is in a dependent clause under the vinculum of the tva．The bope here alluded to is obviously in reference to the Resurrection；rloos

 $\theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$ ，Theoph．The true hopelessness of the old heathen world finds its ead－ dest expression in Esch．Eumen． 648 ，
 fuller details in Lünem．and Jowett， and in answer to the quotation of the latter from the O．T．，the pertinent remarks of Alford in loc．
 believe；reason for the purpose ex－ pressed in the preceding verse，$\ell \nu a \mu \eta$ $\lambda u \pi \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．，based on the funda－ mental truth that as Christ the Head died and rose again，even so shall all the members of His body；comp．Pear－ son，Creed，Art．xi．Vol．I．p． $45^{\circ}$（ed． Burt．），Jackson，Creed，xi．16． 8 sq． The $\epsilon l$ here obviously involves no ele－ ment of doubt，but is simply logical（＇$\epsilon l$ particula est plane logica，＇Herm．Viger， No．312）and virtually assertory；comp． Phil．i．22，and notes on Col．iii．1． àmedavev kal div $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta]$＇died and rose again；＇the two foundations of Chris－ tian faith united in one enunciation； comp．Rom．xiv． 9 （not Rec．）．It is noticeable that the Apostle here as always uses the direct term $\dot{\alpha} \pi \ell \theta a \nu \epsilon \nu$ in reference to our Lord，to obviate all possible misconception ：in reference to the faitbful he appropriately uses the consolatory term коц $\mu$ â $\theta a \iota$ ；see esp．Theod．in loc．oütcs к．т．入．］ ＇so also shall God；＇slightly inexact apodosis：the rigidly correct sequel
 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．（Lünem．，Jowett），or some similar formula．The oüros is not pleonastic（Olsh．），but，as Lünem． correctly observes，marks the com－ plete accordance of the lot of Chris－ tians with that voluntarily assumed by their Lord，while the кal serves to enhance and to give force to the com－ parison ；see Winer，Gr．§ 60．5，p．478， and on this use of kal after relative or demonstrative particles，Klotz，Devar． Vol．in．p． 636.

Tovs
 to sleep through Jesus；＇certainly not equiv．to $\mathbf{e v}^{\prime}$＇I $\eta \sigma$ ．（Auth．，Jowett），but， with the usual and proper force of the prep．，those who through His media－


tion are now rightly accounted as ＇sleeping．＇It must remain to the last an open question whether $\delta i a ̀ \tau o \hat{~}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$ ． is to be connected（ $a$ ）with the finite verb $a \xi \epsilon \in$ ，or（b）with the participle． Chrysostom and the Greek commenta－ tors（silet Theod．）admit both，but prefer the latter；modern writers mainly adopt the former．There is confessedly a difficulty in（b）which the exx．adduced by Alf．scarcely tend to diminish；for the meaning $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \tau 0 \hat{u}$＇I $\eta \sigma 0 \hat{v}$ коц $\mu \eta \theta$ ．（Chrys．），or the more exact meaning advocated above，is but in lax parallelism with
 $\kappa \alpha \cup \chi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ठí aúroû（Rom．v．II），al． Still the arguments against（a）－viz． （1）that thus $a^{⿲} \xi \in i$ would have two participial members，（2）that the na－ tural emphasis would then suggest the order $\delta \iota a ̀$ тô ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$ ．тоѝs коц $\eta \eta$ ．， （3）that the sentence would thus be harsh（De W．）and awkward in the extreme－seem so unanswerable，that with the earlier interpreters，Ath．， and appy．（as the rigid preservation of the order seems to hint）the remaining Vv．，we adopt the more simple and logical connexion коци $\eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a s$ ＇I $\eta \sigma$ ．The two contrasted subjects
 thus stand in clear and illustrative antithesis，and the fundamental decla－ ration of the sentence $\dot{a} \xi \in b \sigma \dot{v} \nu$ a $\dot{u} \tau \hat{\psi}$ remains distinct and prominent，uudi－ luted by any addititious clause．
d＇छєเ $\sigma$ v̀v av่тبิ］＇bring with Him．＇ The more natural word would have been $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \rho \epsilon i$（comp． 2 Cor．iv．14），but the Apostle probably uses the more significant ${ }^{\boldsymbol{a} \xi} \boldsymbol{\xi} \iota$ to mark that blessed association of departed Christians with their Lord at His mapovola，in which the Thessalonians feared their sleeping
brethren would have no part；see above on ver． 13 ．

15．тойто к．т．入．］＇For this we say to you；＇confirmation，not（by an ＇ætiologia duplex＇）of the foregoing iva $\mu \dot{\eta} \lambda u \pi \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \theta \epsilon$（Koch），but of the words immediately preceding．The relation of the faithful living to the faithful dead is explained，first nega－ tively in this verse，then positively in ver．16， 17 ．$\quad \boldsymbol{v}$ 入ó $\mathbf{y}$ м Kvpiov］ ＇in the word of the Lord，＇in coinci－ dence with a declaration received di－ rectly from Him，＇quasi Eo ipso lo－ quente，＇Beza．The prep．is here neither equivalent to кard（Zanch．） nor to $\delta \iota \dot{a}$（Auth．，comp．De W．），but has appy．its usual and prevalent meaning＇in the sphere of；＇the decla－ ration was couched in the language of the Lord Himself，and gained all its force from coincidence with His words； see Winer，Gr．§ 48 ．a，p． 345 ，who however by comparing I Cor ii．7， $\lambda a \lambda o \hat{u} \mu \in \nu \ldots \epsilon^{\prime} \nu \mu v \sigma \tau \eta \rho l \varphi$, I Cor．xiv．6， $\lambda a \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \ldots \notin \nu \dot{a} \pi$ ока $\lambda \dot{\prime} \psi \epsilon \epsilon$ ，gives $\notin \nu$ more of a reference to the form or nature of the revelation than seems fully in accordance with the context．The meaning is simply＇edico Domini man－ datu，＇Fritz．Rom．Vol．III．p． 34 ；so
 This revelation is certainly not to be referred to Matth．xxiv． 31 （Schott 1 ， comp．Usteri，Lehrb．II．2．B，p．325） nor to any traditional＇effatum Christi＇ （Schott 2，and appy．Jowett），but was directly received by the Apostle from the Lord himself；oúk áф＇eaut $\omega \bar{\nu}$ $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda a \dot{a} \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o \hat{~ X ~ X i \sigma \tau o ̂ ̀ ~ \mu a \theta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon \epsilon s ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o-~}$ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ，Chrys．；see Gal．i． 12 and notes， ii．2，Eph．iii．3，and comp． 2 Cor．xii． r．With these passages before us can we say with Jowett that＇St Paul no－ where speaks of any special truths or


doctrines as imparted to himself'? The language of Usteri, l.c. is equally unsatisfactory; not so that of De W. in loc.

ทं $\mu \mathrm{ei} \mathrm{s} \times . \boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda$.$] ' w e$ the living who are remaining.' The deduction from these words that St Paul 'himself expected to be alive,' Alf., with Jowett, Lünem., Koch, and the majority of German commentators, must fairly be pronounced more than doubtful. Without giving any undue latitude to $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{\varsigma}$ (ovi $\pi \epsilon \rho l \dot{\epsilon} a v \tau o \hat{v} \phi \eta \sigma \dot{\prime}$ ...à $\lambda \dot{\alpha}$ тoùs miotoùs $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon$, Chrys.), to
 סè $\tau \grave{a} \sigma \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \tau a$ 入é $\gamma \epsilon$, Method. de Resurr. ap. Ecum.), or to $\pi \epsilon \rho(\lambda \epsilon i \pi \dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} 0$ a ('tempus præsens loco futuri more Hebraico usurpat,' Calv., 'superstites,' Bretsch.), it seems just and correct to say that $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0<$ is simply and purely present, and that St Paul is to be understood as classing himself with 'those who are being left on earth' (comp. Acts ii. 47), without being conceived to imply that he had any precise or definite expectations as to his own case. At the time of writing these words he was one of the $\zeta \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \lambda \epsilon t \pi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o l$, and as such he distinguishes himself and them from the $\operatorname{\kappa oc} \mu \eta \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon s$, and naturally identifies himself with the class to which he then belonged. It does not seem improper to admit that in their ignorance of the day of the Lord (Mark xiii. 32) the Apostles might have imagined that He who was coming would come speedily, but it does seem overhasty to ascribe to inspired men definite expectations proved since to be unfounded, when the context calmly weighed and accurately interpreted supplies no certain elements for such extreme deductions; see notes on I Tim. vi. 14, and comp. the long
note of Wordsw. on ver. 17. On the verb $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, see note on ver. 17 (Transl.) ov̉ $\mu$ ท̀ $\phi \theta$ व́ $\sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu]$ 'shall not prevent,' Auth. i.e. shall not arrive into the presence of the Lord, and share the blessings and glories of His advent, before others. The verb $\phi \theta d \nu \in \iota \nu$ (Hesych. $\pi \rho о \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu, \pi \rho о \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{a}-$ $\nu \in L \nu)$ has here its regular meaning of 'prævenire,' involving the idea of a priority in respect of time, and thence derivatively of privilege; oű $\tau \omega, \phi \eta \sigma\{\nu$,



 $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \stackrel{\partial}{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu$, Theod. On the strengthened negation ov $\mu \grave{\eta}$ with the aor. subj. see Winer, Gr. § 56. 3, p. 450; and observe that the usually recognised distinction between these particles with the fut. and with the aor. (Hermann on Soph. CEd. Col. 853) must not be pressed in the N.T. (opp. to Koch), the prevalence of ov $\mu \cdot \dot{\eta}$ with the subj. being much too decided to justify a rigorous application of the rule; see notes on Gal. iv. 30.
16. отть] 'because,' ? ${ }^{\text {[prop- }}$ terea quod] Syr., 'quia,' ${ }^{\text {Clarom., }}$ 'quoniam,' Vulg., ' unte,' Goth., sim. ※th. (Platt,-Pol. omits), Arm.; reason for the declaration inmediately preceding, derived from the circumstances of detail. To regard b'tı as 'that' (Koch), and as dependent on the preceding тovito $\dot{v} \mu \hat{i} \nu \lambda \in \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$ (ver. I5), mars the logical evolution of the passage, and is opposed to the opinion of the Greek expositors ( $\gamma$ á $\rho$, Theod., Theoph.) and, as is shown above, of the best ancient Versions.
autcis ó Kúplos] ' the Lord Himself;' obviously not 'He the Lord' (De W.),

## 

nor yet 'Himself' with ref. to His glorified body (Olsh.), but simply with ref. to His own august personal pre-


 'with a shout of command,' 'in jussu,' Vulg., Clarom., Goth., sim. Copt. [ouah-sahni], Syr., Arm. The word $\kappa \in \lambda \in \cup \sigma \mu a$ (sometimes, though questionably, кє $\lambda \in \cup \mu a$, Lobeck on Soph. Ajax, 704, p. $3^{23} 3$ ), a $a^{\prime \pi} \pi \lambda_{\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime} \mu}^{\prime}$. in the N. T., occurs frequently in classical Greek as denoting the command or sigual given by a general (admiral, or captain of rowers, Thucyd. II. 92), the encouraging shout of the charioteer (Plato, Phodr. p.253 D) or the huntsman (Xen. Cyneget. vi. 20), or more technically the cry of the $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \pi s$ to the rowers (Eurip. Iph. T. 1405), but in most cases has some ref. more or less distinct to the prevailing meaning of the verb: comp. Prov.xxx. 27 [xxiv.
 tákros, and Philo, de Pram. § 19,


 the $\kappa \in \lambda \in u \sigma \mu a$ is to be referred is somewhat doubtful. The Greek expositors (Chrys.?) seem to refer it directly to Christ; it appears however more plausible to refer it immediately to the d $\rho \chi$ á $\gamma \gamma \in \lambda o s$ as Christ's minister, and to regard it as a general expression of what is efterwards more distinctly specified by the substantives which follow. The purport of the $\kappa \in \lambda_{\epsilon \in \sigma \mu a}$ it is idle to guess at: it may perhaps be $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \varepsilon i \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon, \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \dot{\partial} \nu \nu \mu \phi i o s($ Chrys. I), or more naturally, àvaбт $\hat{\sigma} \iota \nu$ ol $\nu \in \kappa \rho o l$ (Chrys. 2, Theod.), or perhaps, still more probably, with a strict preservation of the current use of the word, the shout of command of the ArchE. T.
angel to the attendant angelical hosts,
 крitijs, Chrys. 3; comp. Matth. xiii. 4r. On the use of $t$ to denote the concomitant circumstances (Arm. uses its 'instrumental' case), see notes on Col. ii. 7 , and comp. Eph. v. 26, dec. Though, with the Aramaic $\rho$ before us, it is not always desirable to overpress $\epsilon y$, yet in the present case it may be used as serving to hint at the кaтdißaбıs taking place during the $\kappa \in \lambda \in \cup \sigma \mu a$, in the sphere of its occurrence; comp. notes on ch. ii. 3 iv $\phi \omega v \hat{\mathrm{I}}$ dipxayyenou] ' with the voice of the Archangel;' more specific explanation of the circumstances and concomitants. To refer ${ }^{2} \rho \chi a \gamma \gamma$. to Christ (Olsh.) or the Holy Spirit (see in Wolf) is obviously wrong : the term is a $\delta i s \lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma^{\prime} \mu$. (here and Jude 9) in the N.T., and designates a leader of the angelical hosts by whom the Lord shall be attended on His second coming; compare Matth. xxiv. 3I, xxv. 3I, 2 Thess. i. 7. With regard to the oblique references of some of the German commentators to the 'jüdischer nachexilischer Vorstellung' (Liin. comp. Winer, RWB. Vol. ir. p. 329, ed. 3), it seems enough to say that the Apostle elsewhere distinctly alludes to separate orders of angels (see notes and reff. on Eph. i. 2 r, Col. i. 16), and that he here as distinctly speaks of a leader of such heavenly Beings: to inquire further is idle and presump-
 trumpet of God;' not'tuba Dei, adeoque magna,' Beng.,-such a form of Hebraistic superl. not occurring in the N.T., but simply 'the trumpet pertaining to God' (gen. possess.), the trumpet used in His service; comp. Rev. xv. 2, and see Winer, Gr. § 36 . 3, p. 221. The Greek expositors ap-



propriately allude to the use of the trumpet when God appeared on Sinai, Exod. xix, 16; comp. also Psalm xlvii. 5, Isaiah xxvii. i3, Zech. ix. I4. With the Jewish use of the trumpet to call assemblies (Numbers x. 2, xxxi. 6, Joel ii. I) we have here nothing to do, still less with the speculations of later Judaism as to God's use of a trumpet to awaken the dead (Eisenmenger, Entd. Jud. Vol. ir. p. 929; adduced by Lunem.): the Apostle twice in one verse definitely states that the trumpet will sound at Christ's advent (I Cor. xv. 52 ), and it infallibly will be so.
ám' oúpavov̂] 'from heaven,'-where He now sits enthroned at the right hand of God; see esp. Acts i. Ir. кal of veкpoí к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] 'and the dead in Christ, \&c.;' consequence and sequel of
 having here a slightly consecutive force; comp, notes on Phil. iv. 12 . The words ${ }^{2} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \stackrel{\sigma}{ } \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ are clearly to be joined with עeкpol, as more specifically designating those about whose share in the mapovola the Thessalonian converts were disquieted : the general resurfection of all men does not here come into consideration; see Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123. Comp. West, Stud. u. Krit. for 1858 , p. 283, and on the omission of the art., notes on Eph. i. 15, and Fritz. Rom. iii. 25, Vol. r. p. 195. The connexion with $\dot{a} \mu a \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma o \nu \tau a l(S c h o t t)$ would indirectly assign an undue emphasis to $\dot{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{X} \mathrm{X} \rho$. (Lien.), and introduce a specification out of harmony with the context: the subject of the passage is not the means by which (2 Cor. iv. 14) or element in which the resurrection
is to take place, but the rebpective shares of the holy dead and holy living in the $\pi$ apovola of the Lord, considered in relation to time.
$\pi \rho \omega ̈$ тcv] 'first;' not with any reference to the $\pi \rho \omega \dot{\prime} \tau \eta$ ávávтaбis, Rev. xx. 5 (Theod., Theoph., Ecum., al.), but, as the following exteiza suggests, only to the fact that the resurrection of the dead in Christ shall be prior to the assumption of the living. The reading $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\omega}$ ot is found in $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$; Vulg., Clarom. ; Cyr., Theod. (t), al., and was perhaps suggested by the supposed dogmatical ref. to the first resurrection.
17. 'smetra] 'then,'-immediately
 second act in the mighty drama. The
 eiTa, Hartung, Partik. Vol. I. p. 302] and the following ${ }^{a} \mu a$ (see below) both seem to suggest, marks the second event as speedily following on the first, and, like 'deinde' ('de rebus in temporis tractu continuis et proximis,' Hand, Tursell. Vol. II. p. 240), specifies not only the continuity but the proximity of the two events; comp. Erfurdt, Soph. Antig. 607.
 living who are remaining,' 'we who are being left behind;' see notes on ver. 15 . ä $\mu a$ のv่v aùtoîs] 'at the same time together with them,' 'simul... cum illis,' Vulg., Copt. [euron]; i.e. we shall be caught up with them at the same time that they shall be caught up, ä $\mu \alpha$ appy. not marking the mere local coherence, 'all together,' Alf., but, as usual, connexion in point of time ('res duas vel plures una vel simul aut esse aut fieri signi-

## 

ficat,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. n. p. 95): comp. Ammon. s. v., ä $\mu \alpha \mu \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{v}$ évть
 and Tittm. Synon. I. p. $15^{6}$, who however remarks that in Rom. iii. 12 (from the LXX) this distinction is not maintained. See notes on chap. v. io.
 caught up in clouds;' certainly not 'in nubes,' Beza, nor even 'auf Wolken,' De W., Lün., but, 'in nubibus,' Vulg., Clarom., i.e. 'tanquam in curru triumphali,' Grot.-the clouds forming the element with which they would be surrounded, and in which they would be borne up to meet their coming Lord : $\epsilon \pi i$ (?) тồ óx $\dot{\eta} \mu a \tau o s ~ ф \epsilon \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$
 $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \lambda a \beta \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}$ aùróv [Acts i. g], каil $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon$ îs ̇̀ $\nu \in ф \in \lambda \lambda a \iota$ à $\rho \pi a \gamma \eta \sigma \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, Chrys. The transformation specified in I Cor. xv. 52, 53 ('compendium mortis per demutationem expuncte,' Tertull. de Resurr. ch. 48, compare Delitzsch, Psychol. vir. 5, p. 368 sq .), will necessarily first take place (comp. Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 357), upon which the glorified and luciform body will be caught up in the enveloping and upbearing clouds. On the nature of the resurrection body, compare Burnet, State of Dep. ch. vir. viri, and the curious and learned investigations of Cudworth, Intellect. Syst. ch. v. 3, Vol. ift. p. 3 Io sq. (ed. Harrison).
The forms $\dot{\eta} \rho \pi a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi a \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a t$ appear to be later forms (Thom.-Mag. p. 412); but the 'librariorum arbitrium' often leaves it uncertain whether the first or second aor. was the original reading; comp. Pierson, Mor. p. 168 (ed. Koch).
 Lord,' as He is coming down to earth;


 крє $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$, Chrys. The expression cis
 6, Acts xxviii. 15) seems to have been derived from the LXX, where it commonly answers to the Hebrew קרקרק as I Sam. ix. $1_{4}$, al. It may be associated either as here with a defining gen., or with a dative (Acts xxviii. ${ }_{5}$ ), the verbal subst. preserving in the latter case the government of the verb from which it is derived; see Bernhardy, Synt. in. 10, comp. Winer, Gr. § 3r. 3, p. 189. Some authorities [ $\left.\mathrm{D}^{1}\left(\mathrm{E}^{1} 7\right) \mathrm{FG}\right]$ read eis $i \pi a \dot{d}$ r $\eta \sigma$ or and the same [with the addition of Vulg. (not Amiat.), Clarom.; Tert., Jer., Hil.] give $\tau \hat{\psi} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$, but with every appearance of correction in both cabes. fls dépa] 'into the air,' 'in eera,' Vulg., Clarom., 'in luftan,' Goth., and sim. the other Vv. except Æth. (Pol.), 'in nube;' dependent on $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi a \gamma \eta \sigma$. Eis dipa is certainly not 'in ccelum' (Flatt), but, as the regular meaning of the word requires, 'into the air,'-though perhaps not necessarily (comp. Wordsw.) with any precise limitation to the terrene atmosphere. The $\dot{\alpha} \eta \rho$, as De W. well observes, marks the way to heaven, and includes the interspace between earth and heaven, with greater or less latitude according to the context; see notes on Eph. ii. 2. To question whether the air is here represented as the final realin of the faitlful (Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. B, p. 338, 441) is surely monstrous: the Apostle makes here a pause, sinply because his design of clearing up the anxieties which his converts entertain is accomplished when he declares that the holy quick and holy dead shall be caught up into the air simultaneously to meet the Lord. The great events imme-
入ózois toútols．


 prepirede，for God has

diately following Christ＇s descent to judgment（see Jackson，Creed，xi，in． 1，2）and His final and eternal union with His Saints in the heavenlyJerusa－ lem（Rev．xxi．xxii．）are to be collected from other passages（see Alf．in loc．）． кal ovitws к．т．入．］＇and вo shall we be ever together with the Lord；＇so，in consequence of this $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \dot{\alpha}\} \in \sigma \theta a l$ ，－the subject of the $\epsilon \sigma^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$（Hesych．$\beta \iota \omega^{\prime}-$ $\sigma 0 \mu \epsilon \nu)$ being clearly both classes pro－ viously mentioned．The force of the oúv，as implying not merely an accom． panying（ $\mu \in \tau a ́$ ）but a coherence with， should not be left uunoticed；see notes on Eph．vi． 23.

18．©̈бTє］＇So then，＇＇Consequently；＇ in consequence of the foregoing reve－ lation．On the force of $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \varepsilon$ and its connexion with the imperative mood， see notes on Phil．ii． 12.
тарака入кîtє］＇console；＇not here ＇exhort，＇＇teach，＇Æth．（both），but，in accordance with the preceding l $_{\nu a} \mu \dot{\eta}$ $\lambda \ddot{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\eta} \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta_{\epsilon}$（ver．I3），＇consolamini，＇Vulg．，
 similarly the remaining $V \mathrm{v}$ ．：see notes on ch．v．11，and on Eph．iv．i．
èv toîs $\lambda$ óyous toúrous］＇with these words；＇not＇words of faith＇（Olsh．）， but simply＇these words＇（roútors not without emphasis），－the words in which the Apostle here delivers to them his inspired message；roûto $\delta \grave{\text { ò }}$ ô $\lambda \in \epsilon \epsilon$
 Chrys．on ver． 15 ．The $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$ is here used in that species of instrumental sense in which the action，dec．，of the verb is conceived as existing in the means；
＇solent Greci pro Latinorum ablativo instrumenti sæpe $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$ præpositionem po－ nere，significaturi in eâ re cujus nomini præpositio adjuncta est vim aut facul－ tatem alicujus rei agendæ sitam esse，＇ Wunder，Soph．Philoct．6o，see exx． in Raphel，Annot．Vol．II．p．549．Thus in the present case the $\pi \alpha \rho d \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ s may be conceived as contained in the divinely inspired words themselves； comp．Jelf，Gr．§622． 3 b．

Ceapter V．i．Mepi $\delta$ é к．t．$\lambda$. ＇But concerning the times and the seasons，＇scil．of the Lord＇s coming， $\tau$ ìs $\sigma u v \tau e \lambda e l a s$ ，Theoph．The terms $\chi \rho o ́ v o s$ and кai $\rho d s$ are not synonymous： the former denotes time indefinitely， the latter a definite period of time （ $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \rho о$ о $\chi \rho o ́ v o v, \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ би́бт $\eta \mu a$ ，Thom．－M．p．489，ed．Bern．）， and thence derivatively the right or fitting time ；comp．Ammon．de Diff．

 mann，Synon．I．p．41，where the meaning of кaupos is carefully investi－ gated，and Trench，Synon．Part il． \＆7．The force of the plural has been somewhat differently estimated． On the whole，it seems most natural to refer it，not to the length of the periods（Dorner，de Orat．Christ．Eschat． p．73），but simply to the plurality either of the acts or of the moments of the time（Lünem．）．There appears no reason to take kal here as explanatory（Koch）：the two words are simply connected by the copula； comp．Acts i．7，र póvous $\grave{\eta}$ кalooús，

Eccles. iii. r, ó $\chi \rho \rho^{\prime}$ os, $\kappa a i$ каı $\rho \delta$, Dan. ii. 21, кaupò̀s kail zpboous, Wisdom viii. 8, кацр $\hat{\nu}$ каї $\chi \rho \prec \nu \omega \nu$.
ova Xeclav "cert] 'ye have no need;' a $\pi a \rho a ́ \lambda \in \iota \psi c s$, see notes on ch. iv. 9. The reason why there was no need does not seem here to be due to any $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\jmath} \mu$ фopoy (Ecum., compare Cbrys., and Acts i. 7) in the Apostle here writing to them on the subject, but, as the next verse suggests, because they had been accurately informed by him by word of mouth of all that it was necessary for them to know. On the qualifying and explanatory object-infinitive, see Krüger, Sprachl. $\$$ 55. 3, comp. § 50. 6. 4,5 .
2. ${ }^{\text {dxpı}} \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{\omega s}$ ] 'accurately;' only used once again by the Apostle, in Eph. v. ry. The use of this adverb, considered exegetically, is very striking. It cenmainly seems to point to special and definite information on the subject; but whether this was derived from a written Gospel (Wordsw.) or from the oral communications of the Apostle cannot possibly be determined. The latter seems much the most probable; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 5. The derivation of $d x \rho$. is slightly doubtful ; most probably from auk $\kappa o s$ in a locative form (ark $\rho \iota$ ), and a root ba-, Benfey, Furzellex. Vol. I. p. $558 . \quad{ }^{2} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{pa}$ Kvpiov] 'the day of the Lord,'s sail. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \epsilon \pi \iota \phi a \nu \epsilon$ las, Theod.; the day of our Lord's coming to judgment (comp. Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 2I,
 а̇токали́лтєта , Luke xvii. 30 ; comp. i Cor. i. 8, v. 5, 2 Cor. i. 14, Phil. i. 6, and for the somewhat similar
 To refer it to the destruction of Jerusalem (Hamm.), or to include in it $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ l $\delta l a \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa d \sigma \tau o u \dot{\eta}_{\mu} \xi \rho a \nu$ (Theoph., comp. notes on Phil. i. 6), is here dis-
tinctly at variance with the context, which treats solely and entirely of the Lord's mapovaia. The reading is hardly doubtful. Rec. gives $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu$. with AKL; most mss.; many Ff.; but though the $\dot{\eta}$ might have been absorbed in the $\dot{\eta}$ of the following $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \rho a$, the probability of insertion (as more definitive) and the preponderance of uncal authority [BDEFGN] are in favour of the omission: so Lachm., Tisch. $\quad$ iss $\kappa \lambda \ell \pi T \eta s$ av vukti] 'as a thief cometh in the night,' anil. ÉpXeral; et puri not being added as a quasi-epithet to $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \eta s$, but belonging to an unexpressed $\notin \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a t$; see Finer, Gr. § 20. 4, p. 126, note. This solemn and regular Scripture simile (comp. Math. xxiv. 43, Luke xii. 39, 2 Pet. iii. Io, Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15) does not contain any reference to the dread felt with regard to the coming (Schott, compare Ale.), but simply to the $\boldsymbol{\text { to }}$ al фvíoov (Theod.) : see esp. Rev. iii. 3,
由̈pay $\ddot{\eta} \xi \omega \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \sigma \epsilon$, aud comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. B, p. 337. The addition $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu u \kappa \tau i$ (comp. however Matt. xxiv. 43, rota $\phi u \lambda a \kappa \hat{y})$ is peculiar to this place, and (combined with Matth. l.c. and xxv. 6) may have given rise to the ancient tradition of the early Church (noticed by Lünem.) that Christ was to come at night on Easter Eve; compare Last. Inst. viI. I9 ('intempestâ et tenebrosâ note'), and Jerome on Match. xxv. 6. ov̈tws
 added to give force and emphasis to the comparison. The pres. $\ell_{p \chi \in \tau a c}$ is not for a future (Pelt, al.), nor yet to mark the suddenness of the event (Bengel, Koch), but its fixed nature and prophetic certainty; see Wines, Gr. §40. 2, p. 237, comp. Bernhard, Sync. x. 2, p. 37 I .


 say；＇certainly not the Jews（Hamm．）， nor even their persecutors generally （Chrys．），but all unbelieving and un－ thinking men ；comp．Matth．xxiv．38， 39，Luke xvii． $26-30$ ．The true be－ lievers were always watching and wait－ ing，knowing the uncertainty and un－ expectedness of the hour of the Lord＇s coming ；comp．Matth．xxiv．44，xxv． 13，Luke xii．35－40．After $\dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{\tau} a \nu$ Rec． inserts $\gamma$ à $\rho$ with KL；most mss．； Vulg．；al．：Lachm．after b̈rav inserts $\delta \epsilon$ in brackets，as it is found in BDEN ${ }^{4}$ ； Copt．，Syr．－Pbil．；Cbrys．，Theod． Though $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ is well supported，and not uncommonly exchanged with ráp（see notes on Gal．i．11），still the tendency to supply expletives is so very decided （Mill，Prolegom．p．clvi．）that we are justified in reading simply btav with AFGN ${ }^{1} ; 4$ mss．；Clarom．，Syr．，Goth．，平th．（both）；many Lat．Ff．So Tisch．，Griesb．，Scholz，De W．，Lünem．， Alf．
 safety，＇scil．＇̇orly，－is everywhere pre－

 distinction between these words is ob－ vious：the first［ $\epsilon \ell \rho \omega$ ，necto，or more probably ep．，$\epsilon t \rho \omega$ ，dico；comp．Ben－ fey，Wurzellex．Vol．II．p．7］betokens an inward repose and security；the latter［ $a, \sigma-\phi \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega$ ；comp．Sanscr．root phal，Heb． Vol．1．p．238，Donalds．Crat．§ 209］ a sureness and safety that is not in－ terfered with or compromised by out－ ward obstacles．

то́тє alqyl－ Soos к．т．入．］＇then with suddenness does destruction come upon them；＇aipulioos not being a mere epithet（adjectivum attributum），＇sudden destr．，＇Auth．，
＇plötzliches Verderben，＇De W．，but a secondary predication of manner（ad－ jectivum appositum），scil．＇repentinus eis superveniet，＇Vulg．，Syr．，Copt． ［chen ou－exapina］，al．，and fully em－ phatic ；see esp．Donalds．Cratyl．§ 303 ， and Müller，Kleine Schriften，Vol．I． p． 3 Io ；comp．Winer，Gr．§ 54．2，p． 412，and notes on Col．ii．3．The verb $\dot{\epsilon} \phi i \sigma \tau a \tau a \iota$ may be either simply ＇imminet，＇Beza，or more derivatively ＇superveniet，＇Vulg．（but not fut．）， being a＇verbum solemne de rebus hominibusve citius quam quis existi－ maverit adstantibus，＇Schott；see esp． Luke xxi．34，$\mu \dot{\eta} \pi о \tau \epsilon \ldots \dot{\epsilon} \pi / \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \phi{ }^{\prime}$ $\dot{v} \mu a ̂ s ~ a i \phi v i \delta i o s ~ \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a$（al申．does not occur elsewhere in the N．T．）．On б $\lambda \epsilon \theta$ oos，comp．notes on I Tim．vi． 9 ．
 Tbe true point of the appropriate comparison（＇$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ vim eam compara－ tivam quam habet is usitato inore auget atque effert，＇Klotz，Devar．Vol． II．p． $7^{68)}$ is neither the knowledge that the event is to come（Theod．）， nor its nearness（De W．），but，as the context seems clearly to suggest，its suddenness and uncertainty；＇mulier doloris materiam．．．．．．gestat absque sensu，donec inter epulas et risus vel in medio somnio corripitur，＇Calv． The form $\omega \dot{\delta} i \nu$ ，like the form $\bar{\delta} \lambda \lambda \phi i \nu$ ， belongs to later Greek ；comp．Winer， Gr．§ 9．2，p．61．
Tŷ èv yaarpl éxov́oy］The regular formula in the N．T．，Matth．i．18， 23．xxiv．19，Mark xiii．1ヶ，Luke xxi． ${ }_{23}$ ，Rev．xii．2．The more usual ex－ pression in earlier Greek appears to have been $\epsilon \nu \gamma a \sigma \tau \rho \dot{l} \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota$（Plato， Legg．vil．p． 792 E ，comp．Hom．Il．
 as in Plato，Epin．p． 979 A，al．


4. $\dot{v} \mu a \hat{s} \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\ell} \rho a]$ So Lachm. with ADEFG; Vulg., Clarom., appy. . Thth. (both) ; many Lat. Ff. (Tisch. ed. i, Schott, Lünem., Koch). C is here deficient. The simpler order of Rec. $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a$ i $\mu \mu \hat{c} s$ is retained by Tizch. ed. 2, 7 , with BKLN ; appy. all mss.; Goth., al. ; Chrys., Theod., Dam., al. (Griesb., Alf.); but appy. with less probability, as the uncial authority is not decisive, and the change is just as likely to have been owing to a conformation to the more natural order, as a transposition for the sake of throwing emphasis on the $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$.
 wise escape,' not $\tau \delta y \tau \epsilon \pi \delta y o \nu$ каі $b \lambda \epsilon$ $\theta \rho o \nu$, Ecum., but simply and absolutely; comp. Heb. ii. 3, xii. 25, Ecclus. xvi. 13. On the strengthened negation oú $\mu \eta$ with the subjunctive, see notes and reff, on ch. iv. I5.
4. í $\mu \mathrm{ei} \mathrm{i}$ 86] 'But ye;' in opposition to the unthinking and unbelieving noticed in the preceding verse: 'occasione accepta ex superioribus adhortatur Christianos ad vigilantiam, sobrietatem, et sanctimoniam,' Calv.
In the following words it is scarcely necessary to say that $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon}$ cannot possibly be imperatival (Flatt): both the negative and the non-occurrence of the imper. $\begin{gathered}\text { ér } \\ \sigma r \epsilon \\ \text { in } \\ \text { the N. T. utterly }\end{gathered}$ preclude such a translation.
èv $\sigma$ кóт $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mathrm{l}]$ 'in darkness,' in the element or region of it. The $\sigma$ кótos here mentioned seems to have been suggested by the preceding ìv vukti (ver. 2): it does not mark exclusively either
 (Chrys., Theoph., Ecum.), as might seem suggested by the succeeding verse, or $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ä $\quad$ yootal (Theod.), as is partially suggested by the preceding verse, but, as the general context requires, both, -_statum ignorantive et viti,' Turretin. It was a darkness not only of the mind and understanding (Eph. iv. r8) but of the heart and will (1 John ii. 9) ; see Andrewes, Serm. xiv่. Vol. แI. p. 37 I .
\va îpâs к.т. $\lambda$.] 'in order that the day should surprise you;' not merely a statement of result, but of the purpose contemplated by Godin His merciful dispensation implied in ovk $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\xi}$ ̇̀̀ бко́тє. See Winer, Gr. § 53. 6, p. 408. It may be doubted however whether we have not here some trace of a secondary force of $q_{\nu a}$ (see notes on Eph. i. 17), the eventual conclusion being in some degree mixed up with and obscuring the idea of finality; comp. Gal. v. 17. Considering the numerous instances of a secondary final use of ipa which the writings of the N.T. (esp. those of St John, Winer, Gr. § 44. 8, p. 303) distinctly supply, and a remembrance of the ultimate decline of the particle into the $\nu \dot{a}$ of modern Greek (Corpe, Gr. p. 129), it is prudent to beware of overpressing the final force in all cases; comp. Winer, Gr.l.c. p. 299 sq.
The 'day' here specified is not specifically the day of judgment [ $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a$ éкel $\nu \eta$ FG; Vulg., Clarom., Syr.], but, as the context seems to require, the period of light (De W.), which indeed becomes practically synonymous with the day of the Lord, as bearing salvation (comp. Rom. xiii. i2), and bringing to light the bidden things of darkness (I Cor. iv. 5). ката-
 Syr., 'adprehendat,' Clarom., 'gafa-



hai,' Goth.; the кãà here not introducing any definite sense of hostility (comp. Koch), but, as usual, being simply intensive, and deriving its further shades of meaning from the context : see the good collection of examples in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. Vol. i. p. 1623 .

The reading $\kappa \lambda \xi \pi \tau a s$ [Lachm. with AB; Copt.] has certainly not sufficient critical support.
5. Távтes $\gamma \mathrm{d} \boldsymbol{\rho} \mathbf{i} \mu \mathrm{\epsilon is}]$ ' for ye all ;' confirmation of the preceding negative statement by a more specific positive declaration. The particle $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$, which we can hardly say with Schott is 'haud necessaria ad sententiam,' is omitted by Rec., but on authority [K (e sil.) ; majority of mss.; Vulg. (Amiat.)] decidedly insufficient.
viol ф $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ós] 'sons of light ;' a Hebraistic formula (comp. Ewald, $G r$. § 287) expressing with considerable emphasis and siguificance, not merely that they c belonged to the light' (Alf.), but that they belonged to it in the intimate way that children belong to a parent, -almost ol $\tau$ à $\tau 0 \hat{0} \phi \omega \tau \grave{s} \pi \rho \alpha \tau \tau 0 \nu \tau \epsilon s$, Chrys., Theoph. : see Winer, Gr. § 34 3. b. note 2, p. 213 , Steiger on ${ }_{1}$ Pet. i. 14, p. 153 , and notes on Eph. ii. 2. Somewhat analogous expressions are found in classical Greek, maî̀es $\sigma 0$ $\phi \hat{\nu} \nu$, $\pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon s$ l $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$., but appy. never (as here) in connexion with abstract substantives ; comp. Blomf. on Asch. Pers. 408.
 night;' the genitive idiomatically specifying the domain to which the subjects belong ; comp. Actsix. 2, and see Winer, Gr. § 30. 5, p. 176. On the various meanings in which this pos--sessive gen. is connected with elvac
and $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, see Krüger, Sprachl. §47.6. I sq., Bernhardy, Synt. III. $4^{6,}$ p. 165, and on the very intelligible $\chi \iota a \sigma \mu o ́ s[\phi \omega ิ s, \dot{\eta} \mu \notin \rho \alpha \ldots \nu \dot{\xi}, \sigma \kappa o ́ \tau o s]$, see Jelf, Gr. § 904. 3, Madvig, Lat. Gr. §473. a. The reading $̇ \sigma \tau \epsilon \grave{c}$ [ $D^{1 F G}$; Syr. (not Phil.), Clarom., Goth., al.] is obviously a conformation to the preceding $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon$.
6. "Apa oivy] 'Accordingly then;' exhortation following on the preceding declaration, the illative á $\rho a$ being supported and enhanced by the collective and retrospective oiv ; see notes on Gal. vi. ro. In Attic Greek this combination is only found in the case of the interrogative a $p a$, comp. Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 181, Herm. Viger, No. 292, and Stallb. on Plato, Republ.
 'let us not sleep,' i.e. be careless and indifferent, $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \nu$
 the very pertinent remarks of Beck, Christ. Lehrwiss. Vol. I. p. 299 (eited by Koch), on the deepening sleep of the soul under the influence of $\sin$; see also Beck, Seelenl. 1. 8, p. 18.
oi $\lambda$ oimol] 'the rest;' here obviously unbelievers, whether careless Jews or ignorant heathens ; comp. notes on ch. iv. 13. Lachm. omits the кal before oi dotrol with ABN; 2 mss. ; Augiens., Vulg. (Amiat.), Syr.; al., but appy. in opposition to St Paul's prevailing usage ; comp. I Cor. ix. 5, Eph. ii. 3, and above, ch. iv. is. $\quad \nu \eta \dot{\phi} \phi \omega \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}]$ 'be sober;' comp. I Pet. v. 8. The $\nu x \phi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ enhances the preceding $\gamma \rho \tau \gamma \%$ $\rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$; Christians were not only to be wakeful, but have all their senses and capacities in full exercise : $\bar{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{\epsilon} \rho q a_{a} \nu$ $\gamma \rho \eta \gamma \circ \rho \hat{\eta} \tau เ \varsigma \mu \eta े \nu \hat{\eta} \phi \eta \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \rho l o t s \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon-$

 $\delta \nu \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota ~ \theta \omega ́ \rho а к а ~ \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s ~ к а \grave{~ a ́ \gamma a ́ \pi \eta s ~ к а i ~} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota к є ф \alpha-$

бeítal $\delta e \iota \nu 0 \hat{\imath}$, Chrys. On the regular meaning of this verb, which appears to be always that of 'sobriety,' not of 'watchfulness' or 'wakefulness' (as perhaps Ecum., è $\pi i \tau a \sigma \iota s \notin \gamma \rho \eta \gamma o ́ \rho \sigma \epsilon \omega s)$, see notes on 2 Tim. iv. 5, and 1 Tim. iii. 2.
 that sleep,' 'sleepers,' Winer, Gr. §45. 7 , p. $3{ }^{16}$; confirmatory explanation of the preceding exhortation by a reference to the prevailing habits of nonChristian hife. At first sight it might seem plausible to give all the words in this verse a spiritual reference (Chrys., Theoph., Koch) : as however $\nu u \kappa \pi o{ }^{\prime}$ seems only to mark the period when the actions referred to usually took place, the literal and proper meaning is distinctly to be preferred: 'quemadmodum in hoc versu dormive ita etiam ebrium esse dicitur proprie, tanquam exemplum ejusmodi sentiendi agendique rationis quæ nonnisi hominum sit in caligine nocturnâ lubenter versantium,' Scbott; so Lünem. and Alf. oi $\mu \in \theta v \sigma \kappa o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o l] ~ ' t h e y ~$ that are drunken.' The distinction advocated by Beng., ' $\mu \epsilon \theta \dot{v} \sigma \kappa о \mu a t$ notat actum, $\mu \epsilon \theta v^{\prime} \omega$ statum' (comp. Clarom. 'inebriantur...ebrii sunt'), seems bere more than doubtful. The transition from 'being made drunk' to 'being actually drunk' is so slight (in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. vv. both are translated 'berauscht seyn'), that with the preceding каөєú $\delta o \nu \tau \epsilon s . . . \kappa a \theta \epsilon u ́ \delta o v \sigma \iota \nu$ before us it seems best to regard them here as simply synonymous.
 we are of the day:' not exactly 'qui diei sumus,' Vulg., Clarom., but 'quum simus,' Æth. (Platt.), Arm., comp.

Goth. 'visandans;' tbe participle not being here used predicatively, but with a slightly causal, or combined 'tem-poral-causal' force; see Schmalfeld, Synt. des Gr. Verb. § 207, comp. Donalds. Gr. §6I5. On the connexion of the gen. with $\epsilon i \mu l$, see notes on ver. 5 .
 ral participle defining the action contemporaneous with or perhaps, more probably, immediately preceding the $\nu \dot{\eta} \phi \epsilon \iota \nu$. The Apostle now passes into his favourite metaphor of the Christian soldier; comp. Rom. xiii. 12, 2 Cor. x. 4, and esp. Eph. vi. if, where not only (as here) the defensive, but the offensive portions of the equipment are described. 'The 'armatura' here consists of the three great Cbristian virtues, Faith, Love, and Hope, the first and second forming the breastplate (aliter Eph. vi. 14, I6), the third (similarly Eph. vi. 17, see notes) the helmet; comp. Reuss, Théol. Chrét. IV. 22, Vol. II. p. 259, 260.

өఉ́рака тโбтє由s] 'a shield of faith,' or more probably 'the shield, \&c.,' the second and third substantives, as well known terms, here dispensing with the article (Winer, Gr. § ig. I, p. 109), and causing the governing noun to be also anarthrous on the principle of correlation (Middl. Gr. Art. III. 3. 6). The gen. is that of 'apposition;' see notes and reff. on $E p h$. vi. 14. каl тєрикє. к.т.入.] 'and as a helmet the hope of salvation;' a defence that can never fail. With hope fixed on the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a$ (Theod.) all the dangers and trials of the present seem light and endurable; $\kappa а \theta \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{a} \rho \dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa \epsilon \phi a \lambda \alpha i ́ a ~ \tau o ̀ ~ к а l \rho ı \nu ~$


 10 Kupiou $\dot{\mu \mu \omega ̈ \nu ~ ' I \eta \sigma o u ̂ ~ X \rho \iota \sigma t o u ̂, ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ a ̀ ~} \pi 0 \theta a \nu o ́ v \tau o s ~ u ́ \pi \grave{e} \rho$


 $\dot{\alpha} \phi i \eta \sigma \iota \quad \delta \iota a \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{i} \nu, \quad \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \quad \dot{\delta} \rho \theta \dot{o} \nu \quad{ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \epsilon \varnothing a \lambda \eta \nu, ~ o u ̈ \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \epsilon \xi \omega \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon l s$ aúrò̀ $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i \nu \epsilon \in \hat{\omega} \sigma a$, Chrys. The gen. $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a s$ is the gen. oljecti, that to which it is directed and on which it is fixed, comp. ch. i. 3 ( $\tau 0 \hat{v} \mathrm{~K} v \rho$.), Rom. v. 2, and, if necessary, Wine, Gr. § $30 . \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{I} 67$.
9. ӧть к.т.入.] 'because, \&c.;' reason for the use of the foregoing words $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta a \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l a s$, expressed both megatively (out $\epsilon \theta \epsilon \tau о$ к.т. $\lambda$.) and positively

 $\sigma \hat{\omega} \sigma a l$, Chrys. oủk er $\theta$ fro $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \hat{\mu} s$ к.т.入.] 'appointed us not unto anger,' ie. to become the subjects of it, to fall under its punitive action. The form ri $\theta \in v a \ell($ Acts xiii. 47) or $\theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ cis $\tau i$ ( 1 Tim. i. I2) appears to have a partially Hebraistic tinge and to answer
 comp. for example Psalm lxvi. g, Jerem. ix. II, xiii. ib. On $\delta \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$, see notes on ch. i. so.
 molnotv owrnplas] 'unto obtaining of salvation,' $\because \underset{\sim}{\text { ? }}$ ? acquisitionem vitæ], sim: Vulg., Clawrom., Copt. [tancho,-here needlessly rendered 'vivificatio;' comp. MaI. iii. $\mathrm{r}_{7}$ ], 'du gafreideinai ganistais,' Goth.; comp. 2 Thess. ii. I4, cis $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi 0$ in $\sigma \iota \nu$ $\delta j \xi \eta s$. Neither here, Heb. x. 39, nor 2 Thess. $l$. $c$., is there any reason for departing from this simple and primary meaning of $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o i \eta \sigma \iota s$; Hesych. $\pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu a \sigma \mu \delta s^{\circ} \kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$, Sui. $\kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$. Both in Eph. i. 14 (see notes) and I Pet. ii. 9, as the context shows, the use is
wholly different, and appy. a reflection of the 0 of the O.T. (comp. Acts xx. 28) : in 2 Chron. xiv. J3 (Heb. הֹTM), Pseud. -Plato, Def. p. 415 C (see Ross u. Palm, Lex. s.v.), the meaning seems to be rather 'conservatio;' but neither the one (apply. favoured by Cecum., comp. Iheod., iva oikeious $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \notin \dot{\eta} \eta \eta$ ) nor the other is here either natural or suitable.
©ıฝ̀ тоиิ Kupiov к.т. $\lambda$ ] Dependent, not on $\begin{gathered}\theta \\ \epsilon \tau \tau \\ \text {, but on the preceding } \pi \epsilon \rho \iota\end{gathered}$ $\pi o i \eta \sigma \iota \nu \quad \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a s$, and specifying the medium by which the $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a$ was to be obtained. This medium is certainly not 'doctrinam eam quam Christus nobis attulit' (Grot.), nor, in this passage, 'faith in Him' (Lünem), but, as the next verse seems to show, His atoning death; comp. Eph. i. 7, and notes in loco.
 died for us;' specification of the blessed act of redeeming love by which the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \frac{i}{\eta} \sigma t s$ $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a s$ has become assure to us; comp. ch. iv. I4. The clause, as Lünem. properly observes, is not causal ( $\dot{a} \pi \circ \theta$. would then be anarthrous, comp. Schmalfeld, Synt. §222, 225 note, and Donalds. Gr.§492), but relative and assertory; 'ne quid de salutis certitudine dubitemus ant de satisfactions soliciti essemus, dicit Christum pro nobis mortuum esse, et pro peccatis nostris satisfecisse, ut salutem consequeremur,' Catv.
On the meaning of $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho$ in dogmatical passages, -not exclusively 'in our stead' (Watery. Scrim. Xxxi. Vol. v. p. 740), see notes and reff. on Gal. iii. 13. For $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho, \mathrm{BN}^{1}$; 17 , here read



that whether we wake or sleep；＇holy purpose of the Lord＇s redeeming death． There is some little doubt as to the exact meaning of the terms ка $\theta \epsilon u \delta \epsilon \iota$ and $\gamma \rho \eta \gamma \rho \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu} p$ ．It seems clear that they cannot be understood in a simple physical sense（comp．Fell），still less in an ethical sense，as $\tau \grave{o}$ кa $\theta \in \dot{\delta} \delta \epsilon i \nu$ was described（ver．6）as a state incompa－ tible with Christianity．There remains then only the supposition that they are used in a metaphorical sense（comp． Psalm lexxviii．6，Dan．xii．2，al．），to which also the following sij $\sigma \mu \mu \nu$ seems very distinctly to guide us．The mean－ ing then is substantially the same as
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \tau o \hat{~ K}$ रplov $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．
It is not exact to say that the sub－ junctive with eli $\tau \ldots$ ．．．li $\tau$ as here is not classical（Alf．），for see Plato，Legg．xir． p． $95^{8 \mathrm{D}}$（v．l．）．As a general rule $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon$ is associated with the same moods as $\epsilon i$（Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p．533）；as however there are cases in which it is now admitted that $\epsilon i$ can be asso－ ciated with the subj．（＇$\epsilon l$ cum conjunct． respectum comprehendit experientiæ， expectandumque esse indicat ut fiat aut non fiat，＇Herm．de Part．${ }^{a z \nu, ~ i 1 . ~ 7, ~}$ see Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p． 500 sq ．）， a similar latitude may rightly be as－ signed to el＇$\tau$ ．It seems probable here that the subj．is used in the dependent clause by way of conformity with the subj．in the principal clause；comp． Winer，$G r$. § $^{\text {I．2．c，p．} 263 \text {（note）．}}$
ä $\mu \mathrm{a}$ бùv aưTヘ̣̂ 乌ท́ण．］＇we should together lice with Him，＇not＇together with him，＇Auth．；the $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu \sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$ form－ ing the principal idea，while the $\ddot{a} \mu a$
 tion of aggregation；comp．Rom．iii． 12，and see notes on ch．iv．17，where the previous specifications of time
make the temporal meaning the more plausible．The $\zeta \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \mu \nu$ is both more emphatic than $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$（ch．iv． 17），and also serves slightly to eluci－ date the metaphorical use of the pre－ ceding words．

II．8ıó］＇Wherefore，＇＇On which account；＇not exactly＇que cum ita sint＇（Alf．），but＇quamobren＇（see Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p．If3，who cor－ rectly assigns the former meaning to oiv），thereby serving to place in closer logical connexion the foregoing decla－ ration and the present exhortation． On the uses of this particle by St Paul， see notes on Gal．iv． 3 r．
тарака入єітєє］＇comfort，＇＇console，＇ OL＇S Syr．，＇consolamini，＇Vulg．， not＇exhortamini，＇Clarom．：the ana－ logy of this verse to ch．iv． 17 （where the contextual argument for the pre－ sent sense is very strong）appears to require a similarity of translation， more especially as the hortatory tone （ver．6）seems now to have merged into the consolatory．The exact meaning of this word is frequently somewhat doubtful：it is used more than fifty times in St Paul＇s Epp．，with several varieties of meaning which can only be decided on by a careful considera－ tion of the context；comp．notes on Col．ii． $2 . \quad$ fis tòv \＆̌va］＇one the other；＇equivalent in meaning to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta^{\prime}$－ خous；see exx．in Kypke，Annot．Vol． iI．p．339，all of which however，except Theocr．Idyll．xxir．65，are from late authors．Compare oi $\kappa \theta^{\prime} \theta^{\prime} \dot{y} a$ ，Eph． v．33，and the somewhat analogous
 al．；see Winer，Gr．§ 26．2，p． 156. To regard cis as a prep．，and to refer $\tau \dot{d} v$ éva to Christ，is in the highest degree forced and improbable；see
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Lünem．in loc．The metaphorical term oikoঠснкíl（I Cor．viii．I，x．23， al．）is derived from the idea，elsewhere both expressed and implied in St Paul＇s Epp．，that Christians form a vads or
 2 Cor．vi． 16 ，Eph．ii． 20 ，al．，and comp． Andrewes，Serm．vi．Vol．II．p． 273. кa0ís kal тоteitt］＇even as ye also are doing；＇praise and encouragement founded on the actual state of the Thessalonian church；comp．ch．iv．J， ro．On the force of кal in compara－ tive sentences of this kind，see notes on Eph．v． 23.

12．＇Epшт $\omega \mu \in \boldsymbol{v}$ 8€］＇Now we beseech you ；＇transition，by means of the $\mathbf{8 k}$ мєтаßaтıкóv（see notes on Gal．iii．8）， to their duties towards the rulers of the church，－a subject not improbably suggested by the words immediately preceding．In no case could the pre－
 out with greater practical benefit to themselves and to the church at large than by showing respect to their ap－ pointed spiritual teachers．On the
 iv．I．
eiféval］＇to know，＇＇to regard，＇＇ut rationem ac respectum habeatis，＇Est．； not＇to show（by deeds）that you know＇（Koch），but simply＇to know，＇ i．e．＇not to be ignorant of，＇＇to recog． nise fully；＇this somewhat unusual meaning of $\epsilon \delta$ ．being analogous to that of the Heb．יָד（see Gesen．Lex． s．v．8），and here approximating in meaning to $\epsilon^{2} \pi \iota \gamma \iota \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu \nu$ ，I Cor．xvi． 18．No instance of a similar or even analogous usage has as yet been ad－ dnced from classical Greek．

are labouring among you，＇＇those who are engaged in sacred and ministerial duties；＇comp．I Tim．v．17，where the more specific $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \lambda o{ }^{\prime} \gamma \varphi$ is supplied． On the meaning and derivation of ко́тоs，колıá $\omega$ ，see notes on I Tim．iv． 1o．This general designation，as the following explanatory terms seem to suggest，is to be referred to the Pres－ byters of the Church of Thessalonica （Thorndike，Prim．Gov，ch．III．Vol．I． p．8，A．－C．Libr．）， $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu \\ \dot{\imath} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \\ \text { ohviously }\end{gathered}$ having no ethical reference， $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ raîs $\kappa \alpha \rho \delta . \dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$（Flatt），still less＇in vobis docendis＇（Zanch．），but simply imply－ ing＇in vestro coetu＇（Schott），＇inter vos，＇Vulg．，－with mere local refer－ ence to the sphere of the кóтоs．
каl троїбтацє́vous к．т．入．］＇and are presiding over you in the Lord；＇fur－ ther explanation and specification of the generic котıढิvтas．The omission of the article plainly precludes any reference of the three participles to three different ministerial classes：the котt $\hat{\nu} \tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}$ are simply regarded under two forms of their spiritual labour，as rulers and practical teachers，and as ＇morum magistri，＇Grot．Whether these duties were executed by the same or different persons cannot be detemnined；at this early period of the existence of the Church of Thess． the first supposition seems much the most probable ；contrast Eph．iv．II， r Tim．v．ri．The sphere of the $\pi \rho o t=\tau a \sigma \theta a c$ was to be $\bar{z} \nu \mathrm{~K} \nu \rho / \varphi$ ：oùk $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ тoîs кобнккоîs dà ${ }^{\prime}$＇̀ $\nu$ тоîs катà Kúptov，Theoph．кal vou日を． тoûvтas ípâs］＇and admonishing you，＇ ＇et monent ros，＇Vulg．；not simply




$\longrightarrow \operatorname{Lin}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{O}$［admonentes］Syr．－Phil．， with reference to the＇exhortationes et correptiones＇（Est．）which it might be their duty to administer．On the proper meaning of $\nu 0 ⿲ \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$, pri－ marily＇to correct by word＇（ Dov $^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \eta \sigma / \mathrm{s}$＇
 $\dot{\text { aj}} \mu a \rho t l a s$, Zonar．Lex．p．1406），and then derivatively by deed－see Trench， Synon．§ 32，and the numerous exx． collected by Kypke，Obs．Vol．II．p． 339.

13．kal ทiyeiotau к．т．入．］＇and to esteem them in love very highly．＇These words appear to admit of two trans－ lations according as $\epsilon \nu \dot{a} \gamma \dot{d} \pi \eta$ is con－ nected（a）loosely with all the fore－ going words，marking the element （certainly not the cause，Schott，2，1）
 $\pi \epsilon \rho / \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega} s$ is to be put in foree，－or（b） closely with the preceding $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \bar{\sigma} \theta \theta a t$ as specifying and enhancing the gene－ ral duty implied in the preceding eidetuat，ver．12．Both involve some lexical difficulties，as in（a）$\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \theta a \mathrm{ar}$ must be regarded as equivalent to $\pi \lambda \epsilon l o v o s \dot{a} \xi \bullet 0 \hat{\nu}$（Theod．），and in（b） $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon i ̄ \sigma \theta a \imath$ èv à $\gamma a^{\prime} \pi p$ must be taken as
 （Chrys．，Theoph．，EEcum．），一solutions neither of them very strictly defen－ sible．On the whole，the context，the appy．similar $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon і ̈ \sigma \theta a l$ $\tau \iota$ év крí $\epsilon \epsilon$ ， Job xxxv． 2 （Schott），and perbaps the
 11．I8（Lünem．），seem to preponderate in favour of（b）：in ver． 12 the Thess． are exhorted to respect their spiritual rulers，in the present verse also to love them．So Schott，Olsh．，and Lünem．The Vv．by preserving care－
fully the order deprive us of all clue to the exact construction they adopt． ed．$\quad$ On the cumulative word $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \kappa \pi \epsilon \rho / \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega} s$, comp．ch．iii．io，and notes on Eph．iii．20．The form $\dot{j} \pi \epsilon \rho-$ ex $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o \hat{\nu}$ is here given by Rec．with AD ${ }^{3}$ EKLN；appy．all mss．；many
 ＇for their work＇s sake；＇on account both of the importance of the work （Heb．xiii．17）and the earnest and laborious manner in which it was per－ formed；comp．Phil．i．22，ii． 30.
tip among yourselves；＇comp．Mark ix．50， Rom．xii．18， 2 Cor．xiii．II．On this not uncommon use of the reflexive for the reciprocal pronoun（ $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o t s$ ），see Jelf，Gr．§ 654．2，Apollon．de Synt． II．27，and for the general principle and limits of the permutation，Kühner on Xen．Mem．II．6．20．Of the con－ verse use（recipr．for refl．）there is no distinct trace found；see Bernhardy， Synt．vI．2，p．273．The reading av－ roîs［ $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FGN}$ ；many mss．；Augiens．， Vulg．，Syr．（both），al．；Chrys．，Theod．］， though distinguished by Griesbach＇s highest commendatory mark（＇indicat lectionem supparem aut æqualem，im－ no forsitan preferendam receptæ lec－ tioni＇），certainly does not seem to deserve it，as it arose in all probability from the feeling that the short admo－ nition was out of place between the longer $\hat{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．（ver．12）and таракал．бє к．т．入．（ver，14）．Under any circumstances it can searcely bear the meaning＇pacem liabete cum eis，＇ Vulg．，Syr．（comp．Chrys．，Theod．），as this would so much more naturally have been expressed by $\epsilon і \rho \eta \nu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \tau \epsilon \mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau^{\prime}$ aì $\hat{\omega} y$ ，as in Rom，xii． 18.




#### Abstract

 we besecch you；＇address，neither $\pi \rho$ òs toùs ä $\rho \chi$ outas（Chrys．），nor $\pi$ oòs tovs $\delta . \delta a, \sigma_{\kappa} \dot{d}$ ous（Thenph．，（Ecum．），but，as the $\dot{a} \delta \in \lambda \phi o i$ suggests，to all（Pseud．－ Ambr．，Justin．）．The Christian bre－ thren at Thessalonica were not only to be at peace with one another，but also to do their best to cause peace to be maintained by others． vou日eтeite tov̀s ditákтovs］＇admonish the unruly；＇those who do not pre－ serve their $\tau d \xi c \nu$ ，＇inordinatos，＇Beza， ＇ungatassans，＇Goth．The term a＇тa－ кros，somewhat laxly rendered by Syr．


 rily and properly，as Chrys．suggests， a＇vox militaris＇（Xen．Mem．iII．i． 7 ，where it is opp．to $\tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s)$ ，and thence derivatively a general epithet to denote a dissolute（Plato，Legg．viI． p． 806 c），ill ordered（ $\pi \in \rho \ell \epsilon \rho \gamma 0 \iota$ кal тapdे тò $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa 0 \nu \pi 0 \circ \circ \hat{u} \nu \tau \epsilon s$, Bekker， Anecd．p．216），and unruly way of



 Chrys．Here the precise reference is probably to the neglect of duties and calings into which the Thessalouians had lapsed owing to their mistaken views of the time of the Lord＇s com－ ing ；comp．ch．iv．Io，II，and 2 Thess． iii． 6 ，II，where alone $\dot{d} \tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \omega s$ occurs．
 2 Thess．iii．7．On the meaning of $\nu 0 v \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon i \nu$ ，see notes and reff．on ver 12. $\pi а р а \mu \nu \theta$ ．］See note on ch．ii．ir． Tov̀s ödเүo廿v́xovs］＇the feeble－minded；＇ perhaps mainly（as the $\pi a \rho a \mu v \theta$ ．seems to suggest）in reference to those who were unduly anxious and sorrowful about the state of the $\kappa о \mu \dot{\omega} \mu \in \nu 0$, ch．
 $\theta v \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \iota \nu \dot{a}, \mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \omega s \dot{a} \theta v \mu o \hat{\partial} \nu \tau a s$ ùvb $\mu a \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ， Theod．，－who however not injudi－


 $\pi \in \iota \rho a \sigma \mu \dot{\partial} \nu$ ．The word $\delta \lambda \iota \gamma o ́ \psi$ ．is a $\ddot{a} \pi$ ．$\lambda_{\epsilon} \delta \delta \mu$ ．in the N．T．，and appy．of rare occurrence elsewhere except in the LXX（Isaiah 1vii．I5，Prov．xviii． 14，al．；comp．Artemid．Oneirocr．in． 5）；the more correct and usual term being $\mu \tau \kappa \rho \delta \psi v \chi o s$, Aristot．Ethic．Ni－ com．Iv．7，Isocr．Panegyr．p． 76 D．
 weak；＇clearly not the weak in body （Luke x．9，Acts iv．9，v． $\mathrm{I}_{5}$ ，I Cor． xi． 30 ），but the weak in faith，$\tau 0 \dot{\prime} s \mu \grave{\eta}$ éspalà кєкт $\mu^{\prime} \in \operatorname{vous} \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ，Theod．； comp．i Cor．viii． 7 ，io，so Chrys．， Theoph．，Ecum．，and nearly all mo－ dern commentators．In Rom．v．6， and appy．I Cor．ix．22，the reference seems to be more inclusive，as marking those who were not Christians，who had not yet received the strength im． parted by the Holy Spirit．The verb ävé $\chi \in \sigma \theta a l$（comp，Matth．vi．24，Luke xvi．13，and more generically Tit．i．9） does not so much setm to imply＇ob－ servare，＇Beng．，as $\dot{\text { vi }} \boldsymbol{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \ell \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，Theod．，
 （Bekker，Anecd．p．408），or perhaps more exactly＇sustinere，＇Clarom． （comp．Goth．，巴th．），with a more direct allusion to the primary and physical meaning of the word；comp． notes on Tit．l．c．，and see Suicer， Thesaur．s．v．Vol．I．p． 37 I ．
$\mu a \kappa \rho o \theta \nu \mu$ ．трòs $\pi$ ávтas］＇be long－suf． fering to all；＇not merely to the three classes just mentioned（Theoph．），but to all，кai $\tau o u s$ olkelous кai rovis $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda 0$－ тplous，Theod．；comp．ver．15．On


#   

 mss.; Syr., Copt., Goth., Clarom., al. (De W., Koch, Lilnem., Griesb. marking it with ${ }^{00}$ ). In ed. 2, 7, Tisch. inserts кal before cis with BKL $\mathbf{N}^{4}$; great majority of mss.; Syr.-Phil., Vulg. (Amiat.); Chrys., Theod., al. (Rec., Alf., Wordsw.); but not on satisfactory grounds, as the external authority seems to prepor: derate for the omission, and the internal arguments (opp. to Alf.) would certainly seem rather in favour of its being an interpolation for the sake of specification, than of its being omitted as unnecessary.
(Eurip. Androm. 689), which here serves to mark that gentle and forbearing patience which is so essentially a characteristic of $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \pi \eta \eta$ (I Cor. xiii. 4), see esp. Basil, Serm. [Symm. metaphr.] xiti. Vol. iIt. p. 784 (ed. Bened. r839), the good notice in Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Vol. II. p. 293 sq., Röthe, Thenl. Ethik, \& 1056 sq., Vol. II. p. 518 sq., and comp. 2 Tim. iii. 10, and notes and reff. on $E p h$. iv. 2. Lastly, $\pi \rho \partial s$ is not merely 'in regard to,' 'ad omnes,' Vulg., Clarom., ' cum omnibus,' Copt., but more precisely and definitely, erga: comp. the Goth. 'vipra,' and see notes on Gal. vi. 10.
 no man render evil, \&c.;' warning against revenge,--yet surely not in the sense that the better among them were to check its outbreaks in others (De W.), but simply that all were to abstain from it; see Lünem. in loc. The usual and correct statement that Christianity was the first system definitely to forbid the returning evil for evil (see Fritz. Rom. xii. 17, Vol. III. p. 91) is called in question by Jowett on the ground that 'Plato knew that it was not the true definition of justice to do harm to one's enemies.' Not to multiply quotations, can we sustain this opinion against de Legg. Ix. p. 868 в, p. 882, al., where vengeance rather than punishment seems certainly contemplated by the legislator? Indivi-
dual instances of the recognition of this precept may be found in heathenism (see Pfanner, Theol. Gentil. ch. Xi. ${ }_{23}^{2}$, comp. Basil, de Legend. Gent. Libr. § 5, Vol. II. p. $2^{51}$, ed. Bened.); but as a general statement the remark of Hermanu seems to be perfectly correct; ' nec laudant Græci si quis iniquis æquus est, sed virtutem esse censent æquis æquum, iniquum autem iniquis esse,' on Soph. Philoct. 679. The formula ó $\rho a ̂ v \mu \grave{\eta}$ (Matth. xviii. 10, Mark i. 44) is of less frequent occurrence than $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu \mu^{\prime}$ (Mark xiii. 5 , Acts xiii. 40, 1 Cor. x. 12, al.), but is more classical and correct: for exx. of it in combination with the pres. and aor. subj.; see, if necessary, the collection in Gayler, Partik. Neg. p. 316 sq

атто母甲] 'rcnder,' 'usgildai,' Goth. The primary idea conveyed by a $\pi$ odi $\delta \delta \partial a t$, scil. 'ubi quid de a'iquâ copià das' and thence 'ubi dando te exsolvis debito' (Winer) here naturally passes into that of 'retribuere,' the какд̀ being represented as something stored up, out of which and with which payment would be made; see Winer, de Verb. Comp. Iv. p. 12, 13, where this verb is well dis. cussed. The opt. $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \delta o \hat{\imath}$ is found in $\mathrm{D}^{2}$ (appy.) $\mathrm{FG}{ }^{1}$, and a a $\pi$ odoí in $^{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{1}$.
 which is good;' not here what is 'morally good' (Linem), but, as the antithesis seems rather to require,

what is 'beneficial,' what proves good


 $\kappa а к о \pi ь \iota \eta \sigma a \nu \tau a, ~ T h e o p h ., ~ c o m p . ~ C h r y s . ~$ Some shade of the same meaning is perhaps apparent in Gal. vi. ro, Eph. iv. 28 (see notes) : here however it seems to be more decidedly brought out by the preceding какóy. On the
 $\tau \iota$, Theoph.) with abstract substantives or their equivalents, see notes and reff. on ${ }_{2}$ Tim. ii. 22, and for exx. of the same use in classical Greek, see Ast, Lex. Platon. s.v. Vol. I. p. 548 sq. The correlative term is каталa $\mu$ $\beta \dot{a v e t} \nu_{,}$Phil. iii. 12, and the antithesis фє́үчш, Plato, Gorg. p. 507 B.
16. тávтотє Xalpєтє] 'Rejoice alway;' Phil. iii. I, iv. 4, comp. 2 Cor. vi. Io; not merely кäv $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho a \sigma \mu 0 i \hat{s}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$ (Theoph.), -a limitation not inappropriate in reference to the recent troubles at Thessalonica, but at all times-under all circumstances and in all dispensations. To the enquiry ' Why should this be a duty?' (comp. Jowett) it seems sufficient to say with Barrow, in his good sermon on this text, - 'if we scan all the doctrines, all the institutions, all the precepts, all the promises of Christianity, will not each appear pregnant with matter of joy, will not each yield great reason and strong obligation to this duty of rejoicing evermore?' Serm. xLiII. Vol. II. p. 557 ; see also sound and comprehensive sermons by Beveridge, Serm. ov. Vol. v. p. 62 sq. (A.-C.Libr.), and Donne, Serm. cxxxI. Vol. $\nabla$. p. 344 sq . (ed. Alf.). The true originating cause (ch. i. 6) and true sphere (Rom. xiv. 17) of this joy is the Holy Spirit, and its more immediate source is Faith; see notes on Phil.i. 25.
 without ceasing;' a precept naturally following on and suggested by the




 $\ddot{\imath} \tau \iota \chi$ रapà $\nu{ }^{\sharp} \xi \xi \in \iota \delta \iota \eta \nu \epsilon \kappa \hat{\eta}$, Theoph. This exhortation to unceasing prayer is distinctly urged by the Apostle in other passages (comp.Eph. vi. 18, Col. iv. 2), and is certainly neither to be explained away as 'a precept capable of fulfilment in idea rather than in fact, (Jowett), nor yet, with Bp. Andrewes, to be referred to appointed hours of prayer (Serm. vi. Vol. v. p. 354, A.C. Libr.), but is to be accepted in the simple and plain meaning of the words, and obeyed, as Barrow has well shown, by cherishing a spirit of prayer, and by making devotion the real and true business of life: see Wordsw. in loc., who appositely cites Barrow, Serm. Vol. I. p. 107 sq . Surely the to $\dot{0} \mu \mathrm{c}-$ $\lambda \epsilon i \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ (Theoph.) is one of those things which is real and actual; ou $\delta \&$ $\tau о \hat{\tau} \tau 0 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \delta \nu \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu, \dot{\rho} \dot{q} \delta \iota o \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha l \tau \hat{\psi}$

 Theod. ; compare Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 2, p. 335. On the duty of constant prayer, see the sound remarks of Hammond, Pract. Catech. III. 2, p. 224 (not quite decided on this text), and on the power of it, compare the noble epilogue of Tertullian, de Orat. cap. 29 .
 every thing give thanks;' not $̇ \bar{\nu} \pi a \nu \pi l$ scil. ка. $\rho \hat{\varphi}$, Flatt (comp. Chrys. $\dot{a} \epsilon i$ ), still less 'in iis quæ vobis bona sunt,' Est, but $\epsilon \nu \pi a \nu \tau l$ scil. $\chi \rho \eta \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \iota$, Chrys. on Plil. iv. 6, Syr.,


'in omnibus,' Vulg., Copt.; comp. 2 Cor. ix. $8, z_{\nu} \pi a \nu \tau i=\pi \dot{a} \nu \tau o \tau \epsilon$, which seems to fix the interpretation, and contrast $\epsilon \nu \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu l$, Phil. i. 28. On the duty of euxapictia, so often dwelt on by St Paul (comp. notes on Col. iii. I5), see Beveridge, Serm. cvir. Vol, v. p. 76 sq ., and on this and on the preceding verses Basil's homily de Grat. Act. Vol. II. p. 34 (ed. Bened. 1839).
тоиิтo Yáp] 'for this,' scil. $\tau \dot{\text { è }} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi a \nu \tau i$ eixap. (Theoph., EEcum.); not with reference to it and ver. 17 (Grot.), bor to it and the two preceding verses (Alf.), for though the three precepts
 especially the two latter-are suffciently homogeneous in character to be included in the singular rov̂ro, yet the peculiar stress which the Apostle always seems to lay on cíxap. (see above) renders the single reference to єíxapıctia apparently more probable; 'gratiæ sunt in omni re agendæ, quia scimus omnia nobis cooperare ad bonum, Rom. viii. 28,' Cocceius; see Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 2, p. 335 . So also Olsh., Bisping, and Lünem., and appy. the majority of recent expositors. After $\gamma$ à $\rho$ Lachm. adds $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ with $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$; several Vv.; and Lat. Ff., but on insufficient external, and appy. opposing internal evidence. The possible doubt caused by the juxtaposition of roûto and $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a$ would naturally suggest the interpolation of the verb subst.
 toward you:' Christ is here represented not exactly as the medium by which (Theoph., Ecum.) but as the sphere in which the $\theta \in \lambda \eta \mu a$ is evinced and has its manifestation ; $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\psi} \kappa \alpha i \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \delta \xi \xi \alpha \tau a$ $\pi о \iota \epsilon \hat{l}$ каi à $\nu a \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \hat{q}$, Athan. contr. Arian. E. T.
iII. 6i, Vol. I. p. 6 ro (ed.Bened. 1698 ). The objects towards whom 'ad vos' (Clarom.)-not 'in vobis' (Vulg., Copt.), nor 'in reference to whom ' (De W.)-it was so evinced, and to whon it was designed to apply, were the converts of Thessalonica. The reference of $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a$ to the 'decretum divinum de salute generis humani per Christum reparandâ' (see Schott) is grammatically doubtful on account of the omission of the article, and by no means exegetically plausible. The $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a$ seems here suitably anarthrous, as marking euxap. as one part and portion out of many contemplated in the collective $\theta \in \lambda \eta \mu a \quad \theta \epsilon o v$; see Liunem. in loc.
19. $\tau \mathbf{~}$ Пvє $\mathrm{u} \mu \mathrm{a}]$ ' the (Holy) Spirit ;' not merely 'vim divinam Christianis propriam' (Noesselt; comp. Beek, Seelenl. p. 37), nor even the gifts of the Spirit as evinced in prophecy (Theod.), nor, more generally, $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ Ev
 (Athan. ad Serap. I. 4 ; see Chrys.), but simply the Holy Spirit, which dwells within in association with our spirit, and evinces His presence by varied spiritual gifts and manifestations; comp. i Cor. xii. 8 sq., and see Waterl. Serm. xxI. Vol. v. p. 641. The subject of prayer leads naturally to the mention of the Holy Inspirer of it (comp. Rom. viii. 26 , Gal. iv. 6), and tbence to the specification of other gifts ( $\pi \rho o \phi \eta r e l a s$, ver. 20) which emanate from the same blessed Source.
$\mu \eta \gamma \quad \sigma \beta \in v v u \tau \epsilon]$ ' $q u e n c h$ not,' whether in yourselvesor in others; contrast 2 Tim. i. 6. The Eternal Spirit is represented as a fire (comp. Andrewes, Serm. Vol. III. p. 124, A.-C. Libr.) which it was regarded as possible to extinguish,-

## 

not however in the present case by a Bios àкádapros (Chrys.), but, in accordance with the context,--by a studied repression and disregard of its manifestation, arising from erroneous perceptions and a mistaken dread of entbusiasm; comp. Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 202 (Bohn). This is more distinctly specified in what follows. For several illustrations of the expression, see exx. in Wetst., the most pertinent of which is Galen, de Theriac.
 $\dot{\rho} \alpha \delta t \omega s$ $\sigma \beta \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \cup \sigma \iota \nu$. Plutarch, de Defect. Orac. § 17 , p. 419 в, à $\pi о \sigma \beta \hat{\eta} v a l ~ \tau \grave{~}$ $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$. Tisch. ed. 7 gives $\zeta \beta \notin \varphi-$ $\nu u \tau \epsilon$ on the authority of $\mathrm{B}^{1} \mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$.
20. троф $\eta$ тєias] 'prophecies;' not merely announcements of what was to come to pass, but, in accordance with the more extended meaning of $\pi \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta}$. $\tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ in the N. T. (see notes on Eph. iv. II), varied declarations of the divine counsels and expositions of God's oracles, immediately inspired by and emanating from the Holy Spirit; see Meyer on 1 Cor. xii. ıo, and Fritz. Rom. xii. 6, Vol. III. p. 55-59. The difference then between ordinary $\delta t$ $\delta a \chi \eta$ and $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon i a$ consisted in this, that the latter was due to the immediate influence of the Spirit, the former to an $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ oikelas $\delta \iota a \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, Chrys.; see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 133 (Bolnn), and for a comparison between prophecy and speaking with tongues, Thorndike, Relig. Assemblies, ch. v. Vol. I. p. 182 sq. (A.-C. Libr.).
ėgoveєveittc] 'despise,' 'set at naught;' a word used in the N. T. both by St Paul (Rom. xiv. 3, ro, 1 Cor. i. 28, al.) and St Luke (xviii. 9, xxiii. If, Acts iv. II), and found also in the LXX and later writers. On this word, and also the more orthographically correct but apparently less usual $\epsilon \xi$ ov-
$\theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon i \nu\left(\right.$ Markix. i2, Lachm.) and $\xi_{\xi} \xi_{0}-$ $\theta \in \nu o u v \nu$ (Mark ix. 12; LXX; al.: Hesych. $\dot{a} \pi о \delta o к \iota \mu \dot{a} \xi \epsilon \tau \nu)$, compare Lobeck, Phrynichus, p. 182. The habit of despising prophecies, here expressly forbidden, most probably arose from instances of $\pi \lambda a \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ and $\pi \lambda a \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon 0 \iota$ in the Church of Thessalonica, who had brought discredit on this spiritual gift. The deduction of Olsh., that up to the present time St Paul had no apprehensions of any of the fanaticism which afterwards showed itself among the Thessalonians (see 2 Thess.), seems in every way questionable; contrast Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 203 sq. (Bohn). They were even now in a state of unrest and disquietude (ch. iv. II sq.) ; nay, the very exhortation before us gains all its point from the fact that the inore sober thinkers had been probably led by the present state of things to undervalue and unduly reject all the less usual manifestations of the Spirit.
21. тávta 8è 8oкıц.] 'but prove all things;' antithetical exhortation to the foregoing: 'instead of despising and seeking to repress spiritual gifts, let them be manifested, but be careful to prove them.' Mádra must thus have a restricted sense, and be linited to the $\chi$ apí $\mu a \tau a$ previously alluded to;
 $\delta_{\nu \tau \omega s} \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon l a s$, Chrys. A more precise exhortation is given to the Corinthians (I Cor. xiv. 29), from which, observing the similar and peculiar subject ( $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta r$ la) here in question, we must conclude that the present precept to exercise spiritual diacernment applied not so much to the Church at large (Neander, Planting, Vol. i. p. r38, Bohn) as more restrictedly to those who had the special gift of $\delta \iota a \kappa \rho i \sigma \epsilon \iota s \pi \nu \epsilon \cup \mu a ́ t \omega \nu$, I Cor. xii. ıo.


In I John iv. I (see Waterl. Serm. xxviI.) the exhortation is appy. more general, but the points to be tried are more elementary, and more easy to be decided on. On the meaning of the verb $\delta o \kappa c \mu d\} \epsilon(y$, see notes on Phil. i. 10, Trench, Synon. Part II. § 24 ; and for an ingenious but improbable explapation both of the word [ to test as a coin] and the following verse, Hänsel, Stud. u. Krit. $\mathrm{s}_{3} 6$, p. s 7 o sq. The $\delta \epsilon$ is omitted by Rec., and by Tisch. ed. 2, but only on the authority of AN ${ }^{1}$; appy. many mss.; Syr., Copt., al. ; Orig., Chrys. (often), Theod., al. On the one hand there is only the internal argument that $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ was interpolated to help out the connexion; on the other hand there is the strong external support, the 'paradiplomatic' argument (comp. Pref. to Gal. p. xvii, Scrivener, Introd. to Criticism of N.T. p. $37^{6}$ ) of the $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ having fallen out before the $\Delta \mathrm{O}$, and lastly the plausible internal argument that $\delta \dot{\delta}$ was omitted to make this sentence equally unconnected with what precedes and follows. то̀ ка入òv катéX.] 'hold fast that which is good;' precept naturally and immediately following on the foregoing: 'exercise the gift of $\delta t a j k \rho \tau \iota s$, and haring found what is really good hold to it ;' $\tau \dot{\alpha} \psi \epsilon u \delta \hat{\eta} \kappa$ кal $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta o-$



 nseaning and derivation of калоs [каб$\lambda$ ds], see Donalds. Cratyl. § 334; but observe that in the N. T. it seems equally co-extensive in meaning with ára $\theta$ ós, and frequentl 5 , as here, denotes what is simply and morally good; see notes on dra $\theta d$ s on Gal. vi. 10, and comp. Aristot. Rhetor. I. 9 (init.), $\kappa a \lambda \partial \nu$

 verse, see an excellent practical sermon by Waterland, Serm. xxir. Vol. v. p. 655 sq.
22. $\dot{\text { àmò } \pi a v \tau o ́ s ~ к . \tau . \lambda .] ~ ' a b s t a i n ~}$ from every form of evil;' general exhortation appended to and suggested by, but not closely connected (De W.) with what precedes; comp. Neand. Planting, Vol. I. p. 204, note (Bohn). In this verse there is some little difficulty, depending first on the meaning of $\epsilon \% \delta o u s$, and secondly on the construction of $\pi$ ov $\eta \rho 0 \hat{v}$. We will notice these separately. Eifos cannot here be 'appearance,' Auth., Calv. (both probably misled by Vulg. 'specie'), as this meaning is more than lexically doubtful (comp. Luke iii. 22, ix. 29, John v. 37,2 Cor. v. 7), and, even if it could be substantiated, would here be inappropriate, since the antithesis seems plainly to lie not between тò ка入дд and any semblance of evil, 'quod malum etiamsi non sit apparet' (Calr., comp. Wordsw. in loc.), but what is actually and distinctly such. We therefore adopt the more technical meaning 'species,' 'sort' (Plato, Epin. p. 990 E , єiठos каl $\gamma^{\ell} \nu 0$, Parmen. p. 129 c , $\tau \mathrm{a} \gamma^{\ell} \ell \nu \eta \tau \epsilon$ кal $\epsilon \delta \delta \eta$ ), which is supported aby abundant lexical authority (see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v., and the numerous exx. in Wetstein in loc.), and is exegetically clear and forcible; they were to hold fast $\tau \delta$ кa $\kappa \delta \nu$ and avoid every sort and species ( $\mu \grave{\eta}$ тoúvou
 of the contrary. So probably Vulg., Clarom., 'specie,' and more plainly Syr. ${ }^{\text {ang }}$ [negotio], Copt. höb [re], Æth. megbär [agendi ratione], Goth., al., appy. the Greek Ff., and nearly all modern commentators. It is more difficult to decide whether $\pi$ own-


poù is an adjective or substantive. Most of the ancient Vv. (Syr., Vulg., Copt., Ath.) adopt the former, and so possibly the Greek commentators; the latter however preserves more correctly the antithesis, and infringes less (comp. Syr., Copt., al.) on the technical meaning of elios. So De Wette, Lünem., Koch, Alf., and the majority of modern commentators. The absence of the article (Bengel, Middl. $G r$. Art. p. $37{ }^{78}$ ) does not contribute to the decision; as abstract adjectives can certainly have this construction, when it is not necessary to mark the wholeness or entirety of what is specified ; comp. Heb. v. I4, Plato,
 $\theta o v$, and see Jelf, $G r . \S 45$ I. г.
The artificial interpretation of Hänsel (Stud. u. Krit. $18{ }_{3} 6$, p. 180 sq.), eid. $\pi о \nu .=\kappa i \beta \delta \eta \lambda o \nu \nu b \mu \tau \sigma \mu a$, founded on the association of this text in several patristic citations with our Lord's traditional saying $\gamma \mathbf{i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon}$ трилє̧їтаı \$6кцноя (see Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. ir. p. 128 I sq.), is here adopted by Baumg.Crus., but rightly rejected by most subsequent expositors. Even if we admit the very doubtful assumption that the simple $\epsilon$ loos might gain from the context the more definite meaning $\epsilon i \delta o s ~ \nu о \mu i \sigma \mu a \tau o s$, the use of $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \chi \chi \in \sigma \in$ in such a form of expression would still be, as De W. observes, appy. unprecedented.
23. Aúròs 8€] ' But may He;' He on whom all depends,-in contrast to them and the efforts they might be enabled to make ; comp. ch. iii. 12, where however the emphasis is somewhat different, and the contrast less definitely marked. jotos Tins clpinv God of whom peace is a characterizing
attribute; the gen. falling under the general category of the gen, of content (Scheuerl. Synt. § i6. 3, p. i15, comp. notes on Phil. iv. 9), and the subst. $\epsilon i \rho \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$ marking tbe deep inward peace and tranquillity which is God's especial gift, and which stands in closest alliance with that holiness which the preceding clauses inculcate. On this meaning of $\epsilon l \rho \dot{\eta} \eta \eta$, see notes on Phil. iv. 7 , and on the various meanings which it may assume in this and similar collocations, see Reuss, Théol. Chrét. Iv. 18, Vol. II. p. 201.
òoteleîs] 'wholly;' 'per omnia,' Vulg.,-in your collective powers and parts; j̀or. marking more emphatically than $\delta \lambda$ ous that thoroughness and pervasive nature of holiness ( $\delta \lambda$ ous $\delta i$ ö $\lambda \omega \nu$, Ecumen., 'secundum omnes partes,' Cocceius) which the following words specify with further exactness:
 $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau^{\prime} \notin \sigma \tau \iota \sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota \kappa a l \psi \nu \chi \hat{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \kappa a l \notin \phi \epsilon \xi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ $\delta \varepsilon \mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$. This seems preferable to thequalitative interpretation'ad perfectum,' Clarom., Ath. (Syr. unites both
 according to which dגote入eís would be used proleptically (Syr.-Phil.; comp. reff. on $\dot{a} \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau$ ovs, ch. iii. I 3 ), but in which the connexion between the substance of the first and second portions of the prayer is less close andself-explanatory. The form $\dot{\dot{o}} \lambda^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} s$ is a ${ }^{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma^{\prime} \mu$. in the N. T., but occurs occasionally in later Greek ; comp. Plutarch, de Placitis Philos. § 21, p. 909 в.
кal] 'and'-to specify more exactly; the copula appending to the general prayer one of more special details; see Winer, Gr. §53. 3, p. 388, and comp. notes on Phil. iv. 12.


## 

...be preserved entire;' not ' your whole spirit...be preserved,'Auth., Wordsw., comp. Syr.; jגokג., as its position shows, not being an epithet but a secondary predicate; see Donalds. Cratyl. $\$ 302$, and comp. notes on Col. ii. 3. This distinction seems to be clearly maintained by all the ancient Vv. (except appy. Syr.); some, as Vulg., al., preserving the order of the Greek, others, as Æth., rendering бло́кл. by an adverb placed at the end of the clause. The adj. òóк $\lambda \eta \rho o s$ is a $\delta i_{s} \lambda \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \mu$, in the N. T. (here and James i. 4), and serves to mark that which is ' entire in all its parts' ( $\varepsilon \quad \nu \mu \eta$ $\delta \in \nu l \lambda_{\varepsilon \iota \pi o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o c, ~ J a m e s ~ l . ~ c .), ~ d i f f e r i n g ~}^{\text {g }}$ from $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon c o s$ as defining rather what is complete, while the latter marks what has reached its proper end and maturity. In a word, the aspect of the former word is (here especially) mainly quantitative, of the latter mainly qualitative; comp. Trench, Synon. § 22, and for exx. see the large collection of Wetst. in loc., one of the most pertinent of which is Lucian, Macrob. § 2,

 also Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. p. 278.
The predicate clearly belongs to all three substantives, though structurally connected with the first. $\quad \dot{\nu} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ rò mvevjua к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.] 'your spirit and soul and body;' distinct enunciation of the three component parts of the nature of man: the $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a$, the higher of the two united immaterial parts, being the 'vis superior, agens, imperans in homine' (Olsh.); the $\psi u \chi \eta$, ' vis inferior que agitur, movetur, in imperio tenetur' (ib.), the sphere of the will and the affections, and the true centre of the personality; see Olshausen, Opusc. p. $1_{54}$, Beek, Seelenl. II. 12, 13, P. 30 sq., Schubert, Gesch.
der Seele, $\S 48$, Vol. II. 495 sq., "comp. Vitringa, Obs. Sacr. p. 549 sq., and more especially Destiny of the Creature, Serm. v., where this text is considered at length, and the scriptural distinction between the $\pi \nu \in \hat{\jmath} \mu a$ and $\psi u \chi \dot{\eta}$ discussed and substantiated. It may be remarked that we frequently find instances of an apparent dichotomy, 'body and soul' (Matth. vi. 25, x. 28, Luke xii. 22, 23), or ' body and spirit' ( 1 Cor. v. 3, vii. 34, cf. Rom. viii. (o), but such passages will be found to be only accommodations to the popular division into a material and immaterial part ; the $\psi v \chi \grave{\eta}$ in the former of the exceptional cases including also the $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$, just as in the latter case the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{0} \mu a$ also comprehends the $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$; see Olsh. l.c., p. 153 note, and contrast the ineffectual denial of Loesner, Obs. p. $3^{81}$. To assert that enumerations like the present are rhetorical ( De W .), or worse, that the Apostle probably attached ' no distinct thought to each of these words ' (Jowett), is plainly to set aside all sound rules of scriptural exegesis. Again to admit the distinctions but refer them to Platonism (Lünem.) is equally unsatisfactory, and equally calculated to throw doubt on the truth of the teaching. If St Paul's words do here imply the trichotomy above described (comp. Usteri, Lehrb. p. 384 sq .), then such a trichotomy is infallibly real and true. And if Plato or Philo have maintained (as appears demonstrable) substantially the same views, then God has permitted a heathen and a Jewish philosopher to advance conjectural opinions which have been since confirmed loy the independent teaching of an inspired Apostle.
ג $\mu$ é $\mu \pi \tau \omega \mathrm{s}]$ 'blamelessly;' the adver. bial predication of quality appended to
 $\pi \boldsymbol{\sigma} \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$.


$\tau \eta \rho \eta \theta \in l \eta$, óóк $\lambda \eta \rho o \nu$ (see above) involving that of quantity. On the meaning of ${ }^{\star} \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o s$, , is in quo nibil desiderari potest,' and its distinction from ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \omega$ $\mu o s$, see notes on ch. ii. ro, and Tittm. Synon. I. p 29.
iv rin mapouaiq к.т. $\lambda$.] Time-the coming of Christ to judgment-when the preservation of the $\dot{\lambda} \lambda o \kappa \lambda \eta p l a$ is especially to be evinced and found to be realized: comp. notes on ch. ii. Ig. On the more exact way in which this блокл $\eta \rho l a$ may be ascribed to body, soul, and spirit, see Destiny of the Creature, p. 107.
24. mเซт's к.т.入.] 'Faithful is He who calleth you,' 'qui vocat,' Clarom., scil. God the Father; comp. I Cor. i. 9 , and see notes on Gal. i. 6 . The tense is neither to be pressed as implying an enduring act (Baumg.Crus., Bisp.), nor to be regarded as identical with the aor. 'qui vocavit,' Vulg., Goth., but simply to be considered as timeless, and as equivalent to a substantive, 'your Caller;' see notes on Gal. v. 8, and Winer, Gr. § 45. 7, p. 316. IIlatds here in ref. to God implies a faithfulness and trueness to His nature and promises (i Cor. i.
 2 Cor. i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 13), and hence becomes practically synonymous with $\dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} s$, Chrys., Theod. ; $\epsilon \nu \gamma \dot{d} \rho \tau \hat{\varphi}$
 $\lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$, Athanas. contr. Arian. II. Io, Vol. I. p. 478 (ed. Bened.), see Reuss, Théol. Chrét. Iv. I3, Vol. II. p. 124.
 exactly 'what I wish' (De W.), nor
 Theoph.), but simply ' that same thing
(Arm.), scil. $\tau \dot{d} \dot{a} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \mu \pi \tau \omega s$ i $\mu \hat{a} s \tau \eta \rho \eta-$ $\theta \hat{\eta}$ val (Bisp., Lünem), or, as the identity of subject suggests, $\tau \dot{d} \dot{\alpha} \gamma$ cá $\sigma a$, and $\tau \dot{\delta} \tau \eta \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a t$,-in a word, the substance of the prayer expressed in the preceding verse. In such cases there is really no ellipse of any pronoun; $\pi$ oteîv is merely ' nude positum,' receiving its more exact explanation from the context; comp. Koch in loc., and Schömann on Isæus, de Apoll. Har. § 35, p. 372.
 for us ;' comp. Eph. vi. 19, Col. iv. 3, 2 Thess. iii. r, Heb. xiii. 18. De Wette and Alf. remark that $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ is here less definite than $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$; but it is very doubtful whether in this and similar formulæ in the N. T. the difference is really appreciable; see notes on Eph. vi. 19, Fritz. Rom. i. 8, Vol. 1. p. 26 , and for the general distinction between the prepositions, notes on Gal. i. 4, and on Phil. i. 7. The prayer was doubtless intended to include reference both to his own personal state and to the general success of his Apostolic work; comp. Cocceius in loc. Whether Silvanus and Timothy are included in $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is perbaps doubtful: Lachm. inserts in brackets кal before $\pi \epsilon \rho l \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, but on authority $\left[\mathrm{BD}^{1}\right.$; a few mss. ; Clarom., Sangerm., Syr.Phil., Goth.] scarcely sufficient.
26. di $\sigma \pi$ d́ $\sigma a \sigma \theta \in$ к.т.ג.] 'Salute all the brethren;' concluding exhortation, apparently addressed to the Elders of the Church (consider ver. 27). In the parallel passages, Rom. xvi. 16, i Cor. xvi. 20, and 2 Cor. xiii. 12 ( $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \boldsymbol{l} \varphi$ $\phi \iota \lambda$., see Fritz. Rom. l. c.), comp. I Pet. v. 14, the exhortation is $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \dot{a}^{\prime}$.


27. [áyiocs] dं $\delta \in \lambda \phi o \hat{s}$ ] The reading is very doubtful. Rec., Scholz, and Tisch. ed. 7 , insert á ${ }^{\text {ylocs }}$ with AKL; most mss.; Syr. (both), Vulg., Copt., Goth., Ath. (Platt), Arm.; Chrys., Theod. (De Wette, Koch). It is omitted by Laclm. and Tisch. ed. ı, 2, with BDEFGN ; 6 mss.; Clarom., Eth. (Pol.); Atabrst. (Lünem., Alf.). Though the uncial authorities strongly preponderate for the omission, still the almost unanimous testimony of the $V \mathbf{v}$., and the probability that a word, here used somewhat uniquely by St Paul in adjectival connexion with a $\delta \in \lambda \phi o i ̂ s$, should be omitted as superfluous, prevent our excluding it altogether from the text: comp. Heb. iii. i. The epithet is certainly not without pertinence in reference to the adjuration and strength of language which marks the verses: all the brethren, viewed generally as Christians, were holy (comp. Numb. xvi. 3), and would especially profit by having this letter read to them.

 $\delta_{i}^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$ aủroùs $\dot{a} \sigma \pi a ́ j \epsilon \tau a l$, Chrys. The Oriental custom of kissing in their greetings (Winer, $R W B$. s.v. 'Kuss,' Vol. I. p. 688) is here enhanced with Christian characteristics : it is to be a
 v. 14, an 'osculum paeis,' Tertull de Orat. cap. I4, а $\phi i \lambda \eta \mu a \quad \mu v \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu$, Clem. -Alex. Padag. iII. in, Vol. i. p. 30I (ed. Potter),-whether as given after prayer (Just. M. Apol. 1. 65 ;
 $\phi(\lambda \eta \mu a)$, or more probably as a token of brotherly love and holy affection,no ille, meaningless, and merely pagan custom of salutation. On this custom, see more in Bingham, Antiq. 1II. 3.3, Augusti, Archäol. Vol. Ir. p. 718 sq., Coteler on Const. Apost. l. c., and Fritz. Rom. xvi. 16, Vol. III. p. 310. The prep. $\epsilon \nu$ may here possibly mark the accompaniment (see notes on Col. iv. 2), but is more naturally taken as simply instrumental; the $\phi i \lambda \eta \mu a$ being that in which, so to say, the $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi a \sigma \mu \delta{ }^{2}$ was involved; see notes on ch. iv. 18.
27. Ėvopкí̧ $\omega$ ípãs к.т. $\lambda$.] 'I adjure you by the Lord.' This very strong
form of entreaty has been differently explained. There does not seem sufficient reason for concluding from ver. 12, 13, with Olsh., that there had been such differences between the Elders and the Church of Thessalonica as to sug. gest a fear that the Epistle might not be communicated to the church at large; as the language of those verses is admirably calculated both to bespeak respect for the Elders, and to conciliate the Church. That the expression arose from slight distrust combined with a $\theta \epsilon \rho \mu \dot{\eta} \delta c a y o u a$ towards his converts (Chrys., Theoph.) is improbable; that it was a customary form with St Paul (Jowett I) is indemonstrable ; that the inspired Apostle was not master of his words or did not know their value (Jowett 2) is monstrous. We therefore may perhaps fall back on the reason hinted by Theodoret and expanded by recent expositors,-that a deep sense of the great spiritual importance of this Ep., not merely to those who were anxious about the $\kappa о \nsim \mu \dot{\mu} \mu \nu_{0}\left(\right.$ (ch. iv. ${ }^{13}$ ) but to all without exception, suggested the unusual adjuration ; $b \rho \kappa о \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \epsilon$,


# 28 <br> 'H $\chi$ ápıs toû Kupiou $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \bar{u} \quad$ Benedictio. $X \rho ı \sigma \tau o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \hat{\theta}^{\dot{j}} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$. 

$\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega v$, Theod. The objections of Baur are briefly but satisfactorily answered by Neander, Planting, Vol. II. p. 126 (Bohn). The verb ${ }_{\epsilon \nu} \nu \rho \kappa$. [Rec. has the more usual j $\rho \kappa i \zeta \omega$ with $D^{2} D^{3}$ FGKLN ; mss.] is appy. not found elsewhere, and is even omitted in the best modern lexicons.
tòv Kúpıov] Accus. of the person; comp. Mark v. 7 , Acts xix. I3, and for the similar construction of $\dot{\delta} \kappa \kappa 6 \omega$, see Jelf, $G r . \S 5^{8} 3.140$. On the two forms $\dot{\delta} \kappa \kappa 0 \hat{\nu}$ and $\dot{\delta} \rho \kappa \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, and the prevalence of the former in Attic writers, see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 360, 36 I .
ávayvootiqvaı] 'be read-as the context suggests-publicly;' comp. Luke iv. 16, Acts xv. 2 1, 2 Cor. iii. i5, Col. iv. 16. This meaning ('palam pralegatur,' Schott) is however not specially due to the prep. $a^{2} \nu d$, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \gamma \nu$. is frequently used without any accessory notion of publicity, but is reflected on the verb by the general tenor of the sentence. The aor. infin. perbaps refers to the single act (Alf.), but must certainly not be pressed, as this tense in the infinitive, especially after verbs of 'hoping,' 'commanding,' \&cc. (see notes on ch. iv. ro), is often used in reference not merely to single acts, but to what is either timeless (' ab omni temporis definiti conditione libera et immunis' Stallb. on Plato, Euthyd. p. 140), or simply eventual, and dependent on the action expressed by the finite verb; see Scheuerl. Synt. § 3r. 2 b,
p. $320 \mathrm{sq} .$, Winer, Gr. § 44. 7. b, p. 296, and esp. Schmalfeld, Syntax, $\$ 173.4$, p. 346, 一where the different moods of the infin. are carefully considered and contrasted.
28. ' $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{X}}$ apts к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.] The concluding benedictions of St Paul's Epp. are somewhat noticeably varied. Adopting the best attested readings, we may observe that the shortest form is $\dot{\eta}$ $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota s \mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\dot{v}} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, Col. iv. $18,{ }_{2}$ Tim. iv. 22 (preceded by $\dot{o} \mathrm{~K} \dot{\rho} \rho \operatorname{los}$ 'I. X. $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu$. $\sigma o v$ ), and similarly $\dot{\eta} \chi$. $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\pi \operatorname{rá}^{\nu} \tau \omega \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, Tit. iii. 15 , [Heb. xiii. 25,] and $\dot{\eta} \chi$. $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{d} \sigma \circ \hat{0}$, г Tim. vi. 21; the longest being the familiar benediction in 2 Cor. xiii. 13. Of the rest we bave first, $\dot{\eta} \chi$. тồ Kuptov $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ 'I. X. $\mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\dot{j}} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, as here and Rom. xvi. 20 ; 2 Thess. iii. 18 and Rom. xvi. 24 (a doultful verse) give $\pi \alpha^{\prime} v \tau \omega \nu \dot{\dot{v}} \mu$.; 1 Cor. xvi. 23 omits $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$ and probably X $\rho \iota \sigma$ Tồ, and appends $\dot{\eta}$ á $\gamma \dot{a} \pi \eta \mu_{0} \mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$

 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, as Philem. 25, Gal. vi. 18 (adding $\dot{d} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \circ \ell)$, Phil. iv. 23 (om. $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu)$. And lastly, $\dot{\eta} \quad \chi . \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 d $\phi \theta a \rho \sigma l a$, Eph. vi. 24. See Koch on Philem. 25, p. 135sq. The aju $\bar{\eta} \nu$ [Rec. with $\mathrm{AD}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKLN}$; mss.] is appy. rightly omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. with $\mathrm{BD}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$; mss.; Clarom., Sangerm., Vulg. (Amiat.), al, being very probably a liturgical addition.

## IIPOS OESEAAONIKEIS B.

## INTRODUCTION.

THIS short but important Epistle was written by the Apostle to his converts at Thessalonica a short time after his First Epistle, and apparently from the same place. If, as seems highly probable, Corinth be regarded as the place from which the First Epistle was written (see Introd. to the First Ep.), we may reasonably suppose the present Epistle to have been written from the same city: the same companions (ch. i. i, comp. i Thess. i. 1) were still with the Apostle (contrast Acts xviii. 18); similar forms and circumstances of trial appear to have been surrounding him (ch. iii. 2, compared with I Thess. ii. 16, Acts xviii. 6).

The exact time at which the Epistle was written cannot be determined. If the First Epistle was written soon after the arrival of Timothy from Macedonia (ch. iii. 6), and towards the commencement of the Apostle's eighteenth-month stay at Corinth (Acts xviii. it), we shall probably not be far wrong in placing the date of the Second Epistle towards the end of the first twelve months of the Apostle's residence there (comp. ch. iii. 2 with Acts xviii. 12,
 but a few months after that of the First Epistle. We may then specify the autumn of A.D. 53 as an approximately correct date: see Davidson, Introd. Vol. II. p. 449.

The circumstances which gave rise to the Epistle seem clearly to have been some additional information which the Apostle had received concerning the disquieted state of the minds of his converts. Whether this reached him through the bearer of the First Epistle, or formed the substance of a letter from the elders of the Church of Thessalonica, must remain mere conjecture. This much however seems to be certain, that some letter had been circulated at Thessalonica purporting to come from the Apostle (ch. ii. 2) which, combined probably with some teaching equally said to be derived from St Paul (comp. notes on ch. ii. 2), had added
greatly to the general excitement, and rendered it necessary for this Second Epistle to be written, and to be vouched for by a clear mark of genuineness (ch. iii. 17). The purport of the letter and the teaching was clearly to the effect that the day of the Lord was at hand; and it does not seem improbable that this might have been based on some expressions in the First Epistle (ch. iv. 15, 16, 17, v. 2 sq.), which had been distorted or exaggerated so as better to keep alive the feverish anxiety and unregulated enthusiasm of the converts in this busy city. We may thus perhaps, with Davidson (Introd. Vol. II. p. 448), consider it more probable that the Second Epistle was an indirect than a direct result of the First. It was apparently not so much designed to correct innocent misapprehensions of the former Epistle (Paley, al.) as to remove a positively false construction which had been put-whether with a partly good or mainly bad intent we know not-both on that Epistle and on the Apostle's general teaching.

The whole Epistle indeed is so clearly supplemental to the First (comp. also ch. ii. 15) that we may without hesitation reject the opinion of Grotius and Ewald, who reverse the order of the two Epistles.

The main object of the Epistle then was to calm excitement, and to make it perfectly plain that the Lord's second Advent was not close at hand, nay, that a mysterious course of events previously alluded to (ch. ii. 5), of which the beginning could confessedly be already recognised (ver. 7), had first to be fully developed. Corrective instruction is thus the chief subject; with this however is associated cheering consolation under afflictions (ch. i. 4 sq.), and direct exhortation to orderly conduct (ch. iii. 6), industry (ver. 8 sq.), and quietness (ver. 12 ).

The authenticity and genuineness are supported by early and explicit external testimonies (Irenæus c. Har. iII. 7. 2, Clem.Alex. Strom. v. p. 655 , ed. Pott., Tertullian de Resurr. Carn. cap. 24), and have never been called in question till recently. The objections however are of a most arbitrary and subjective character, and do not deserve any serious consideration. Complete answers will be found in Lünemann, Einleitung, p. 163 sq., and Davidson, Introd. Vol. in. p. 454 sq.

## MPOL OEESAAONIKEIS B.

Apostolic address and salutation.

II



 'Iŋбoû X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{u}$.
2. $\pi a \tau \rho \delta s \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ The reading is doubtful. Tisch. (ed. 2, 7) omits, and Lachm. brackets $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ with BDE; 3 mss.; Clarom., Sangerm.; Theoph.; Ambrst. (ed.), Pel. (Lünem., Alf.). C is deficient. The pronoun is retained in Rec. with AFGKLN; appy. great majority of mss.; Syr. (both), Aug., Vulg., Goth., Ath. (both), Copt., Arm.; Chrys., Theod., al. (Griesb., but marked with ${ }^{0}$ ),-and appy. rightly; for on the one hand the preponderance of external authority is very decided, and on the other the probability of an omission either accidentally or intentionally, owing to the $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ just preceding, is not much less than the probability of an interpolation to conform with other Epistles.

1. Hầ入os kal Euhovavds kal T.] The same form of salutation as in the First Epistle; see notes in loc. The only difference lies in the addition of $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ to $\pi a \tau \rho l$, which, contrary to what we might have expected, does not appear to have suggested any variety of reading. For a brief account of Silvauus and Timothy, who are here, as in the First Ep., associated with the Apostle as having co-operated with him in founding the Church of Thessalonica, see notes on I Thess. i. r.
2. Xápıs vipìv kal tipívı] Regular form of salutation, uniting both the Greek $\chi$ aipeti and the Hebrew صitite (Gen. xliii. 23, Judges vi. 23, al.); $\tau$ d


$\sigma \tau 0 \lambda \omega \hat{\nu} \epsilon l \omega \theta a \mu \epsilon \nu$, Theod.-Mops. p. 145 (ed. Fritz.) : see more in notes on Eph. i. 2, and in the long and laborious note of Koch on 1 Thess. i. I. The remark of Thom. Aquin. is not without point, ' $\chi$ d́ $\rho$ s qua est principium omnis boni, $\epsilon i \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \eta$ quæ est finale bonorum omnium;' see also notes on Col. i. 2. ảrd Өtoû matpòs ทㅆ.] 'from God our Father;' scil. as the source from which it emanates. In 2 John 3 we find mapd in the same combination, but with a difference of meaning that in the present case (in ref. to God) is scarcely appreciable, and depends perhaps entirely on the usage and mode of conception of the writer. St John, for example, uses $\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha}$ (with gen.) and $\dot{d} \pi \dot{d}$ in a propor-

## 94 IIPOミ $\operatorname{\theta E\Sigma \Sigma A\Lambda ONIKEI\Sigma ~B.~}$

## 


 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ö $\tau \iota \dot{\imath} \pi \epsilon \rho \alpha \nu \xi \alpha \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota \dot{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \iota s \dot{v} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu, \kappa \alpha \mathfrak{\imath}$ His calling．
tion rather more than I to 3 ，while St Paul uses the same prepp．in a pro－ portion of it to nearly ro．The gene－ ral distinction between these prepp． （à $\pi b$ ，emanation simply ；$\pi a \rho a ́$, eman． from a personal source）and the more frequently used $\epsilon \kappa$ is well stated by Winer，Gr．§ 47．b，p． 326.
кal Kuplov к．т．$\lambda$ ．］Scil．кal àmò Ku－ plov к．т．入．；not каl maтрд̀s Kuplov к．$\tau . \lambda$. ，an interpretation rendered lighly improbable by the occurrence of $\pi a \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ without any gen．－here possibly （see crit．note）；with less doubt in Gal． i．3，I Tim．i． 2 ；and with no var．of reading in 2 Tim．i． 2 ，Tit．i． 4 ；see notes on Eph．i．3．
 to give thanks，＇scil．St Paul，Silvanus， and Timothy．Though we must be cautious in pressing the plural in every case，yet in the present，when we re－ member the relation in which Silvanus and Timothy stood to the Church of Thessalonica，it can bardly be over－ looked：see notes on I Thess．i．2．On this use of $\epsilon \dot{u} x a \rho / \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ in the sense of $\chi^{d} \rho \iota \nu{ }_{\chi}^{\ell}{ }_{\chi}{ }^{\epsilon L \nu}$ ，see notes on Phil．i．3， and for the constructions of cixap．， notes on Col．i．12．The occurrence in this connexion of so strong a word as $\delta \phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ is well worthy of note．
$\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{i} \dot{\mu} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}]$＇coneerving you ；＇with no very appreciable difference from $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ （Eph．i．r6）in the same formula；see notes on I Thess．i．2，v．25，and for the distinction between these preposi－ tions in cases where they appear less interchangeable，see on Gal．i．4，and
 ＇̇otiv］＇as it is meet；＇not on the one hand a mere parenthetical addition to the preceding eixap．í $\phi \in$ ．（＇ut par
est，＇Beza），nor yet on the other an emphatic statement of the＇modus eximius＇（Schott；кal $\delta \iota \grave{a} \lambda\langle\gamma \omega \nu$ каl $\delta_{i}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \gamma \omega \nu$ ，Theoph．2）in which such a єìzapiotia ought to be offered，but simply a connecting clause between the first member of the sentence and the distinctly causal statement $\delta \bar{\sigma} \tau$ vimepavそápet к． $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda$ ．which follows，and with which кä̀̀s äłıov к．т．$\lambda$ ．stands in more immediate union．Thus，as Lünem．well observes，while the ó $\phi \epsilon l$－ $\lambda о \mu \epsilon \nu$ states the duty of the $\epsilon \dot{x}$ xapertla on its subjective side，ка日ं̀s к．т．入． subjoins the objective aspects．Few probably will hesitate to prefer this simple and logical explanation to any assumption so injurious to the inspired writer as that of a tautology design－ ed to supply the place of emphasis （Jowett）． ötc will thus be not relatival，，［quod］Syr．，but dis－ tinctly causal，＇quoniam，＇Vulg．， Clarom．，Eth．（both），Goth．，Syr．－ Phil．，－in close union with the clause immediately preceding．It may be remarked that few particles in St Paul＇s Epp．cause a more decided dis－ crepancy of interpretation than 8 of ． Bet wee the merely objective（Winer， Gr．§ 53．9，p．398）and the strictly causal force（id．8．b，p．395）of the particle it is not only often very diff－ cult to decide，but in several passages （e．g．Rom．viii．2I）exegetical con－ siderations of some moment will be found to depend on the decision．
itsepav̧̧ável］＇increaseth above mea－ sure；＇a är．$\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$ ．in the N．T．and not a very common word elsewhere， comp．Andoc．contr．Alcil．p． 32 （ed． Steph．），тoùs imepavgavoutvous．The predilection of St Paul for emphatic


compounds of $\dot{u} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ has been noticed and briefly illustrated on Eph. iii. 20; see also Fritz. Rom. v. 20, Vol. I. p. 35r. It may be observed that $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho a \nu \xi a ́ v \epsilon \iota$ appears to be associated with $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota s$ as conveying more distinctly the idea of organic evolution and growth (comp. Matth. xvii. 20,
 term is used which expresses more generally the idea of spiritual enlargement, and of extension toward others; comp. notes on x Thess. iii. x .
Évods éкáotov к.т.入.] ' of every one of you all toward each other;' not without distinctive emphasis, - first, in specifying that this $\dot{\alpha} \gamma d \pi \eta$ was not merely general, but was individually
 àjain $\eta$ eis $\pi d \nu \tau a s$, Theoph.), and secondly, in showing that it was not restricted in its exhibitions to those who loved them, but extended to all their fellow-Christians at Thessalo-


 On this verse see five practical sermons by Manton, Works, Vol. Iv. p. 420-458 (Lond. 1698).
4. ท̊ $\mu$ âs av่тoús] 'we ourselves,'as well as others, whether among you or elsewhere, who might call attention to your Christian progress more naturally and appropriately than those who felt it to be humanly speaking due to their own exertions, but who in the present case could not forbear. De Wette compares I Thess. i. 8, but it may be doubted whether St Paul had here that passage very distinctly in his thoughts. To refer $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a}$ s aúrous to St Paul himself, in contrast to his assgciates included in the preceding plural verbs (Schott), seems distinctly
illogical : and to leave open the possibility that this may be only an instance of 'false emphasis or awkwardness of expression' (Jowett) can only be characterized as a subterfuge at variance with all fair, sound, and reasonable exegesis. The distinction between $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i$ is aútol (in which the emphasis falls on the $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s$ ) and avizol $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i=1$ (in which it falls more on the aúroi, comp. I Thess. iv. 9) is illustrated by Krüger, Sprachl. § 51. 2. 8. The order aúrois $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ is here actually given by $\mathrm{BK} ; 7 \mathrm{mss}$. Ev ípiv tvкavxâo $\theta a \mathrm{a}]$ 'boast in you;' you were the objects of it, and the sphere or rather substratum of its manifestation ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 48. a. 3. a, p. 345, and see notes on Gal. i. 24. The somewhat rare form $\hat{p} \kappa \alpha u \chi \hat{a} \sigma \theta a t$ is found a few times in the LXX, e.g. Psalm lii. 1, cvi. 47, al., in ecel. writers, and in Æsop, Fab. ccoxbII. p. 139 (ed. Schneider). The reading is not by any means certain: Rec. with DE(FG кavХ $\dot{\prime} \sigma a \sigma \theta a c) \mathrm{KL}$; mss.; many Ff., reads кavxãotau; but the probability that the change to the simpler and more common form is due to a corrector is in this case so great that the reading of Lachm. and Tisch., supported by ABN; 17, must be considered to deserve the preference. C
 Ocov] 'in the Churches of God,' scil. in Corinth and its neighbourhood, where the Apostle was at the time of writing this Ep.; comp. Acts xviii. ri, and see Wieseler, Chronol. p. 254 sq . The remark of Chrys., è $\nu$ -


 $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a t s$, -must be received with reservation; as there seems no reason for



thinking that the Epistle was written any later than the spring of $54 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{D}$. , probably a few months earlier; comp. Lünem. Einleit. p. 160.
 patience and faith;' precise subjects of the Apostle's boasting. There is no $\varepsilon \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu} \delta \dot{d} \delta 00 \hat{\nu}$ in these words, scil. $\dot{v} \pi о \mu о \nu \eta \hat{s} \epsilon \nu \quad \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon$, Grot., - ever a doubtful and precarious assumption (see Fritz. on Matth. p. 853 ff. Excurs. iv. where this grammatical formula is well considered), nor does $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota s$ here imply 'fidelis constantia confessionis' Beng., 'Treue,' Lünem.,-a doubtful meauing of miotts in the N.T., especially when the more usual meaning las just preceded (ver. 3) in reference to the same subjects. The Thessalonians evinced faith in its proper and usual sense, in bearing up under their tribulations, and believing on Him while they were bearing His cross. On the meaning of $\dot{i \pi} \pi \mu 0 \nu \dot{\eta}$ (here almost taking the place of $\epsilon \lambda \pi i s$, Neand. Planting, p. 479, Bohn), which in the N.T. seems ever to imply not mere 'endurance' but 'brave patience,' see notes and reff. on I Thess.i. 3 . $\pi a ̂ \sigma เ v$ seems clearly to belong only to $\delta \omega \gamma \mu o i s$; the article would otherwise have been omitted before $\theta$ Mí $\psi \epsilon \sigma \cdot \nu$. The distinction between the two words appears sufficiently obvious: $\delta \omega \omega \gamma \mu$ òs is the more special term ('injurias complectitur quas Judæi et ethnici Christianis propter doctrinm Christianæ professionemimposuerunt,' Fritz.), $\theta \lambda i \psi / s$ the more general and comprehensive; see Fritz. Rom. viii. 35, Vol. II. p. 221.
als dés$\left.X \in \sigma \theta_{\epsilon}\right]$ ' which ye are enduring,' 'quas sustinetis,' Vulg., Clarom.; ordinary
and regular attraction (Winer, Gr. § 24.1 , p. 147)-for $\dot{\omega} v \dot{d} v \epsilon \chi$., if we follow the analogy of 2 Cor. xi. 1 , 2 Tim. iv. 3 ,-or for às aveX., if we follow the more usual structure of the verb in classical Greek. In the N.T. àéXouat is associated most commonly with persons, and but rarely with things; in both cases however it is followed by a gen., while in earlier Greek it generally, esp. with persons, takes the accus.; see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. Vol. I. p. 22\%. The present tense shows that the application is still going on, and is in no way at variance with 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. $I_{4}$ (contrast Baur, Paulus, p. 488, notes), which refer to an earlier persecution that appears to have partially subsided before the first Epistle was written. The present allusion, as Lünem. rightly observes, is to some fresh outbreak. On this verse and on the remaining verses of the chapter, see sixteen practical sermons by Manton, Works, Vol. v. p. 393-514 (Lond. 1698).
5. *v $\mathbf{\varepsilon \epsilon เ \gamma \mu a ~ к . т . \lambda . ] ~ ' ( w h i c h ~ i s ) ~ a ~}$ token or proof of the righteous judg. ment, \&c.;' appositional clause to the whole foregoing sentence, and practi-
 к.т. .; comp. Pbil. i. 28 [whence observe the comparatively slight difference of meaning between the two verbals], and see Fritz. Rom. xii. i, Vol. 1III. p. 16. The apposition here seems to be not accusatival (Rom. xii. 1, I Tim. ii. 6), but nominatival, Ez $\delta \in \epsilon \gamma \mu a$ not referring merely to the clause that more immediately involves the verb, but to all the preceding words, $\tau \hat{\eta} \bar{\nu} \dot{u} \pi о \mu 0 \nu \hat{\eta} s-\dot{d} \nu \in \chi \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ : the

## 

endurance of all their persecutions and their afflictions in patience and
 крíeces rố $\theta \epsilon 0 \hat{\text { i ; comp. Rom. viii. 3, }}$ and see Winer, Gr. § 59. 9, p. 472. The reference of ${ }^{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu a$ to the Thessalonians ('ipsi Thessal. adversa sustinentes intelligi possunt esse exemplum justi judicii Dei,' Est.) is grammatically plausible, but both logically and exegetically improbable and unsatisfactory: the proof of the righteous judgment of God was not to be looked for in the Thessalonians themselves, but in their acts and their patient endurance.

Tท̂s $\mathrm{\delta} \mathrm{~L}$ кalas kplacws] 'the just judgment,' that will be displayed at the Lord's second coming (comp. ver. 7), when they who have suffered with and for the Lord will also reign with Him; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 12. To refer the סוкaia кpiots solely to present sufferings as perfecting and preparing the Thessalonians for future glory (Olsh.) is to miss the whole point of the sentence : the Apostle's argument is that their endurance of sufferings in faith is a token of God's righteous judgment and of a future reward, which will display itself in rewarding the patient sufferers, as surely as it will inflict punishment on their persecutors; tovє $\sigma a \phi \hat{\omega} \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ кıv $\delta u ́ \nu \omega \nu \tau a ̀$



cls то кaтa乡เル0.] 'that ye may be counted worthy;' general direction of the $\delta \iota к a i a$ к $\rho l \sigma t s$ and object to which it tended. This infinitival clause has been associated with three different portions of the preceding sentence; (a) with als $\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \chi \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$, scil. 'quas afflictiones sustinetis eo fine et fructu ut...efficiamini digni regno Dei,' Est.;
(b) with ${ }^{\prime} \nu \delta \epsilon \subset \gamma \mu \alpha-\Theta \epsilon 0 \hat{v}$, scil. 'que perseverantia vestra judicii divini justissimi olim futuri pignori inservit, quod hoc attinet ut digni judicemini,' Schott 2; (c) with סokalas кןlocws, so as to mark either ( I ) the result to which it tended, Lunem., or (2) the aim which it contemplated, De Wette. Of these, while (a) causes the really important member $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu \alpha \kappa . \tau, \lambda$. to relapse into a mere parenthesis, and (b) infringes on the almost regular meaning of $\epsilon l s$ $\tau \delta$ with the infin., (c) preserves the logical sequence of clauses and the usual force of $\epsilon l s \tau \delta$ with the infin. Whether however the result or the aim is here specified is somewhat doubtful. The decidedly predominant usage in St Paul's Epp. of $\epsilon l_{s} \tau \delta$ with the inf. suggests the latter (Winer, Gr. § 44. 6, p. 295, Meyer on Rom. i. 20, note) : as however there seems some reason for recognising elsewhere in the N.T. a secondary final force of $\epsilon l s \tau \delta$ (see notes on I Thess. ii. 12), we may perhaps most plausibly in the present case regard the ката $\xi t \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \kappa, \tau, \lambda$. not purely as the purpose, 'in order to,' Alf., but rather as the object to which it tended: the general direction and tendency of the кpiocs was that patient and holy sufferers should be accounted worthy of God's kingdom. tîs Barolelas tov̂ Ecov̂] 'the kingdom of God;' His future kingdom in heaven, of which the Christian here on earth is a subject, but the full privileges of which he is to enjoy hereafter; see notes on I Thess. ii. 12, and comp. Bauer's treatise there alluded to, de Notione Regni Div. in N. T. in Comment. Theol. Part II. p. 120 sq. $\dot{\mathbf{v} \pi t \rho}$ îs kal тáбXєтє] 'for which ye are also suffering;' not exactly 'pro quo consequendo,'



Est., but, with a more general reference, 'in behalf of which,' 'for the aske of which,'-the $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ marking the object for which ('in commodum cujus,' Usteri, Lehrb. iI. i. i, p. 1ı6) the suffering was endured (comp. Acts v. 4 I, Rom. i. 5, see Winer, $G r$. § 48. l, p. 343), while the кai with a species of consecutive force supplies a renewed hint of the counexion be$t_{\text {ween }}$ the suffering and the катa $\xi \omega$ $\theta \hat{\eta} v a \iota \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. On this force of кaí, see Winer, Gr. §53.3, p. $3^{87}$, and comp. notes on I Thess. iv. r. The clause thus contains no indirect assertion that sufferings established a claim to the kingdom of God (à $\pi \dot{\delta} \tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \dot{a} \sigma \chi \in L$
 Theoph.), but only confirms the idea elsewhere expressed in Scripture that they formed the avenue which led to
 Chrys.), and that the connexion between holy suffering and future blessedness was mystically close and indissoluble; comp. Acts xiv. 22, Rom. viii. 17. On the general aspects of suffering in the N.T., see Destiny of the Creature, p. 36-43.
6. eltep 8ikawov] 'if so be that it is righteous;' confirmation, in a bypothetical form, of the preceding declaration of the justice of God, derived from His dealings with their persecutors. The $\mathfrak{\ell l} \pi \in \rho$ thus involves no doubt
 $\beta \varepsilon \beta a t \omega \sigma \epsilon \omega s$, Theod.), but only, with a species of rhetorical force, regards as an assumption (' $\epsilon!\pi \epsilon \rho$ usurpatur de re quæ esse sumitur,' Hermann, Viger, No. 310) what is really felt to be a certain and recognised verity; sl敨
 Chrys. On the force of elimep, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 528, and on
its distinction from $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon$, comp. notes on Gal. iii. 4. The word סixaloy evidently points back to the $\delta$ ккala крiбts in ver. 5, not with any antithetical allusion to the grace of God (comp. Pelt), but in simple and immediate reference to His justice as regarded under the analogies of strict human
 סíкalov, $\pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi} \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \pi a \rho \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$, Chrys.), and as inferred from His own declarations: comp. Rom. ii. 5, Col. iii. 24, 25 . $\quad$ apd $\Theta \epsilon \hat{\uparrow}]$ ] before God,' ' with God,' 'apud Deum,' Vulg.
. Or $^{7}$ [coram Deo] Syr.; the secondary idea of locality ('motion connected with that of closeness,' Donalds. Cratyl. § 177) being still faintly retained in the notion of judgment as at a tribunal, e. g. Herod. III. 160, $\pi$ a $\rho$ à $\Delta a \rho \epsilon l \varphi$ к $\rho \iota \tau \hat{\eta}$; comp. Gal. iii. II, and see Winer, Gr. $\$ 4^{8 .}$ d, p. 352. On the meaning of duzatoסidóval, see notes on I Thess. iij. 9 . тois $0 \lambda$ [ $\beta$ ouctv к.т. $\lambda$.$] 'to those that$ aftict you affiction;' the 'jus talionis' exhibited in its clearest form : the $\theta \lambda t-$ $\beta$ ovies are requited with $\theta \lambda i \psi c s$, the $\theta \lambda \iota \beta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota$ with äve $\quad \iota$. Theoph. subjoins the further comparison; oú $\chi$



 кal al à $\nu$ é $\sigma \in \iota s$ vínì zotav̂tat.
7. tois $\theta \lambda_{2} \beta$ opevots] 'who are afficted;' passive, clearly not middie, 'qui pressuram toleratis,' Beng., as the antithesis would thus be marred, and the illustration of the 'jus talionis' rendered somewhat less distinct.
 in company with us who are writing to you, and who like you have been

#  



8．$\phi \lambda o \gamma l \pi v \rho b s]$ So Lachm．（text）with BDEFG；7I ；Vulg．，Clarom．， Syr．，Goth．，al．；Iren．（interpr．），Maced．，Theod．（comment．？），Ecum．，Tertull． （Scholz，Tisch．ed．у，Lünem．，Wordsw．）．In ed．2，7，Tisch．adopts $\pi v \rho i \phi \lambda o \gamma \delta s$ with AKLN ；nearly all mss．；Syr．－Phil．（marg．）；Chrys．，Theod．（text），Dam．， al．（Rec．，Alf．，Lachm．marg．）C is deficient．The expression adopted is here on the whole the better supported，but both in Exod．iii． 2 and in Acts vii． 30 there is a similar variation of reading．
exposed to suffering；see ch．iii．2．To give $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s$ a general reference（ De W ．） would not be strictly true，and would impair the encouraging and consola－ tory character of the reference； $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \dot{d} \gamma \in \epsilon$

 ánoбтo入ıк仑̂̀，Ecum．＂Aveats is simi－ larly used in antithesis to $\theta \lambda \beta \beta \epsilon \theta \theta a$, and $\theta \lambda \psi \psi / s$ in 2 Cor．vii． 5 ，viii． 13 ；it properly implies a relazation，as of strings，and in such combinations stands in opposition to $\begin{aligned} & \text { enlta } \\ & \text { cs } \\ & \text { ；comp．}\end{aligned}$
 $\tau \dot{d} \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{kal} \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \chi \circ \rho \delta \omega \hat{\nu}$ ．It here obviously refers to the final rest in the kingdom of God；and forms one of the elements of its blessedness consi－ dered under simply negative aspects； comp．Rev．xiv．${ }^{13}$ ．

Év $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{n}$ dтокал．к．т． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\text {．］＇at the revelation of }}$ the Lord Jesus；＇predication of time when the dutarbjoots shall take place． The term $\dot{a} \pi о к \dot{\alpha} \lambda \nu \psi i s$（ I Cor．і． 7 ，comp． Luke xvii．30）is here suitably used in preference to the more usual mapovala， as perhaps hinting that though now hidden，our Lord＇s coming to judge both the quick and dead will be some－ thing real，certain，and manifest；$\nu \hat{v} \nu$

 jє $\sigma \pi \dot{\prime} \tau \eta \rho$ ，Theoph．dim’ ov̉pavov̂］ Predication of place：it is from hea－ ven，from the rigbt hand of God where He is now sitting，that the Lord will come；comp．I Thess．iv．i6，and

Pearson，Creed，Art．vii．Vol．i．p．
 §vváp．av่тov］］＇accompanied with the angels of His power；＇predication of manner ；the Lord will come accom－ panied with the hosts of heaven，who shall be the ministers of His will and the exponents and instruments of His power．The gloss of Theoph．and
 סvearol，followed by Auth．，al．，but found in none of the best $\boldsymbol{V}_{\mathbf{v}}$ ．of antiquity，is now properly rejected by appy．all modern commentators．The gen．appears simply to fall under the general head of the gen．possessivus， and serves to mark that to which the $a^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda o c$ appertained，and of which they were the ministers；comp． Bernhardy，Synt．III．44，p．161， Winer，Gr．§ 34．3．b，p． 211 （note）． The Syr．inverts the clause，sc． －هوَ virtute Angelorum suorum］，and may have suggested the equally incorrect and inverted paraphrase of Michaelis， ＇das ganze Heer seiner Engel：＇the former however is corrected in Syr．－ Phil．，and the latter has been pro－ perly rejected by all recent expositors． On the force of $\mu \epsilon \tau$ id in this combina－ tion，see notes on I Thess．iii．i3．
8．iv \＄入oyt $\pi u p o s]^{\prime}$＇in a flame of fire，＇i．e．encircled by，encompassed by a flame of fire；continued predica－ tion of the manner of the $\dot{a} \pi o \kappa d \lambda v \psi \iota s$ ；

  

'in libris V.T. sæpenumero ignis et flamma commemoratur, ubi de præsentiầ et efficacitate Numinis divini singulari modo patefacienda, præsertim de judicio divino, sermo est, Exod. iii. 2 sq., Malach. iv. 1, Daniel vii. 9 , 10,' Schott. The addition thus serves not only to express the majesty of the Lord's coming, but is noticeable as ascribing to the Son the same glorious manifestations that the Old Test. ascribes to the Father. The Syr., Eth. (Platt), and, if the punctuation can be trusted, some of the other $V \mathbf{v}$. (comp. Theoph. r) connect this clause with $\delta \iota \delta \delta \nu \tau 0 s \in \kappa \delta \delta k$. as an instrumental clause (Jowett actually unites both interpr.), but without plausibility; the attendant heavenly hosts and the encircling fire seem naturally to be associated as the two symbols and accompaniments of the divine presence.
 scil. $\tau \hat{v}$ K vplov'I $\eta \sigma$., not in connexion with $\pi v \rho \dot{s}$, which would not only be a halting and unduly protracted structure, but would wholly mar the symmetry of the two clauses of manner. The formula $\delta \iota \delta \delta v a t$ ék $\delta k$. only occurs here in the N. T., but is occasionally found elsewhere; see Ezek. xxv. 14, and comp. ä $\pi 0 \delta 0 \hat{0} v a \iota$ Exס. in Numb. xxxi. 3. No exx. of its occurrence have been adduced from classical Greek ; $\epsilon \kappa \delta l \kappa . \pi o \backslash \eta \eta^{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \theta a \iota$ is found in Polyb. Hist. in. 8. $10 . \quad$ tois $\mu \mathrm{i}$ elisóvเv ©cóv] 'to those who know not God,' who belong to a class marked by this characteristic; first of the two classes who will be the future objects of the divine wrath, 'qui in ethnicd ignorantiâ de Deo versantur' (Beng.), -in a word the Heathen. On the
peculiar force of the subjective negation, see notes on I Thess. iv. 5, and comp. Winer, Gr. § 55. 5, p. 428 sq.
 not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus;' second class of tbose who aflicted the Thessalonian converts, those whose characteristic was disobedience generally, and especially to the Gospel (Rom. x. 16),-in a word, the unbelieving Jews. It is somewhat singular that a scholar usually so sound as Schott should have felt a difficulty at the division into two classes: surely the article before $\mu \dot{\eta}$ inaк. renders such a view all but certain; see Winer, Gr. § 19. 5, p. 117, Green, $G r$. p. 215. Even in seeming exceptions to the rule (Matth. xxvii. 3 [Rec.], Luke xxii. 4 [Tisch.], al.) it may be fairly questioned whether the writer did not in these particular cases really intend the two classes to be regarded as separate, though otherwise commonly united. The reading is slightly doubtful; Rec. adds, and Lachm. inserts in brackets, Xpiatoũ with AFGN; mss.; Vulg., Clarom., Syr., Goth., al. C is deficient. Though the omission of $\mathrm{X} \rho$. does not characterize this Ep. as it does the first (see notes on I Thess. iii. 13), 'I $\eta \sigma$. alone [with BDEKL; 25 mss.; Copt., Syr.-Phil., Ath.; many Ff.] is on the whole the more probable reading here.
9. oltives] 'men who;' reference by means of the qualitative rel. pronown to the two preceding classes. If we revert to the distinctions stated in the notes on Gal. iv. ${ }^{2}$, it would seem that $\delta \sigma \tau \iota s$ is here used, not in a causal sense with ref. to the reason

## 

for $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu$（Lïnem．，Alf．－who how－ ever mix up two usages），but expli－ catively（＇who truly＇），or even simply classifically，with ref．to the class or category to which the antecedents are referred，and to the characteristics which mark them；see notes on Gal．ii． 4，and on Phil．ii．20．The brief dis－ tinction of Krüger（Sprachl．§ 50．8）， that of has simply an objective aspect， $8 \sigma \tau \iota s$ one qualitative and generic，will in most cases be found useful and applicable．For other and idiomatic usages，see Ellendt，Lex．Sophocl．s．v． Vol．II．p． $3^{81}$ sq．，and comp．Schaefer， notes on Demosth．Vol．II．p． 53 I．
8iкŋv тlбovoเv］＇shall pay the penalty．＇ This formula does not occur elsewhere in the N．T．（comp．however Siкך $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \chi \in c \nu$ ，Jude 7），but is sufficiently common in both earlier and later Greek，and is copiously illustrated by Wetst．in loc．
ö入є日pov alóvLov］＇eternal destruction；＇accus． in apposition to the preceding $\delta i \kappa \eta \nu$ ： on $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \lambda\end{aligned} \theta \rho \rho$ ，comp．notes on I Tim．vi． 9．All the sounder commentators on this text recognise in al $\dot{\prime} \nu L o s$ a refer－ ence to＇res in perpetuum future＇ （Schott），and a testimony to the eternity of future punishment that cannot easily be explained away：

 Пâ̂̀os $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon$ ，Theoph．；comp．Pear－ son，Creed，Art．XII．p． $4^{65}$（ed． Burton）．In answer to the efforts of some writers of the present day to give alúvcos a qualitative aspect，let it briefly be said that the earliest Greek expositors never appear to have lost sight of its quantitative aspects ；$\dot{\alpha} \rho t-$
 Bos aíuviov таúт $\eta \nu$ áтока入é $\sigma a s$ ，Theod． For further remarks on this subject， see notes and reff．in Destiny of the

Creature，Serm．IV．，and for a dis－ cussion of the grave question of the eternity of divine punishments， Erbkam，in Stud．u．Krit．for 1838 ， p． $4^{22}$ sq．The reading of Lachm．（non marg．）ó $\lambda \epsilon \theta \rho \iota o \nu$［with $\mathbf{A}$ ； 2 mss．；Ephr．，Chrys．（ms．）］is far too feebly supported to deserve much con－ sideration．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \pi \rho o \sigma \omega^{\prime} \pi о$ u sov̂ Kvp．］＇removed from the presence of the Lord．＇These words have re－ ceived three different explanations， corresponding to the three meanings， temporal，causal，and local，which may be assigned to the preposition． Of these $\dot{a} \pi{ }^{\circ}$ can scarcely be here（ $a$ ） temporal（á $\rho \kappa \in \hat{\imath} \pi a \rho a \gamma \in \nu \in \sigma \theta a t \quad \mu \delta \nu_{0}$

 comp．Theoph．，（Ecum．），as the subst． with which it is associated（not $\pi a \rho$－ ovoias but $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \pi \sigma$ ）seems wholly to preclude anything but a simple and quasi－physical reference．Equally doubtful is（ $b$ ）the causal translation； for though aं $\pi o^{\prime}$ may be thus associated with neuter and even passive verbs， as marking the personal source whence the action originates（see exx．in Winer，Gr．§ 47．a，p．332，comp． Thiersch，de Pentat．II．15，p．106）， yet，on the other hand，such a con－ nexion in the present case would in－ volve the assumption that $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\omega} \pi \sigma$ тô̂ Kuo．was a periphrasis for the personal $\tau 0 \hat{\text { K }}$ Kplou（Acts iii．19，cited by De W．，owing to the dissimilar nature of the verbs，is no parallel）， and merely equivalent to＇præsente Domino＇（comp．Pelt），－a resolution of the words in a high degree precarious and doubtful．We therefore adopt（c） the simply local translation，according to which $d \pi o$ marks the idea of ＇separation from＇（Olsh．，Liunem．）， cmkedma［＇de devant＇］尼th．，while

##  

$\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\sigma} \pi \sigma u$ тố Kup. retains its proper meaning, and specifies that perennial fountain of blessedness (comp. Psalm xvi. if, Matth. xviii. ro, Rev. xxii. 4), to be separated from which will constitute the true essence of the fearful 'pœna damni' (Jackson, Creed, xi. 20. 9) : see further details in Schott and Lünem. in loc., by both of whom this view is well maintained. The article before Kuplou is omitted hy DEFG; $10 \mathrm{mss} . \quad \mathbf{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ 8óg ๆs к.т.入.] 'from the glory of His might;' not 'His mighty glory,' Jowett, -a most doubtful paraphrase, but the glory arising from, emanating from His might (gen. originis, comp. notes on I Thess. i. 6), the $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$ being regarded, so to speak, as the result of the exercise of His loxús, and as that sphere and halo which environs its manifestations. The assumption of De W. that in this clause $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o}$ has a causal force is perfectly gratnitous.
10. örav Eג0p] 'when He shall have come;' specific statement of the time in which the preceding $\delta i k \eta \nu$ tioovat shall be brought about and accom-
 $\psi \eta \hat{\eta}{ }^{2} \nu \quad \theta a \nu \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu$ ä $\pi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$, Theod. On the force of os ouv with the aor. subj. as referring to an objectively possible event, which is to, can, or must, take place at some single point of time distinct from the actual present, but the exact epoch of which is left uncertain, see Winer, $G r . \S 42.5$, p. 275, and esp. Schmalfeld, Synt. § 121 , where the nature of the construction is well discussed. The most natural and idiomatic mode of translation is briefly noticed in notes to Transl.
 к.т. $\lambda_{\text {.] ' to be glorified in (the persons }}$ of) His saints;' infinitive of design or
purpose,—notequivalent to $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. (Jowett), from which it is grammatically distinguishable as involving no reference to mode or degree ; see notes on Col. i. 22, where both formulæ are briefly discussed. The verbitself is a $\delta i s$ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N.T. (here and ver. 12 ), and, except in the LXX (Exod. xiv. 4, Isaiah xlv. 25 , xlix. 3, al.) and eccl. writers, is of rare occurrence. The prep. seems here very distinctly to mark-not the mere locality 'among His saints' (Michael.), still less the instruments or media of the glorifica-
 the substratum of the action, the mirror as it were (Alf.) in which and on which the $\delta \dot{\delta} \xi \underline{a}$ was reflected and displayed ; comp. Exod. xiv. 4, Isaiah xlix. 3, and see notes on Gal. i. 24.

Lastly, the äzoc do not here appear to be the Holy Angels, but, as the tacit contrasts and limitations of the context suggest, the risen and glorified company of believers; contrast I Thess. iii. 13, where both $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon s$, and the absence of all notice of the unboly, suggest the more inclusive reference. $\operatorname{\theta av\mu a\sigma \theta \hat {\eta }va\iota к.\tau .\lambda .]~}$ ' $t o$ be wondered at in all them that believed;' scil. owing to the reflection of His glory and power which is displayed in those who believed on Him while they were on earth; 'obstupes. cent Christum in credentibus tam magnum et gloriosum esse,' Cocceius. The aor. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma a \sigma \iota \nu$ [Rec. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma v \sigma \iota \nu$, but in opp. to all MSS. ; many Vv. and Ff.] is here suitably used in connexion with the period referred to : at that time the belief of the faithful would belong to the past; comp. Wordsw, in loc. For exx. of this pass. use of $\theta a v \mu d j \omega$, see Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 342.
öтเ $\ell \pi\llcorner\sigma \tau \in \dot{\theta} \theta \eta$


к.т.ג.] 'because our testimony unto you was believed;' parenthetical clause taking up the preceding $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma a \sigma \iota \nu$, and giving it a more distinct reference to those ( $\epsilon \phi^{\prime} \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s$ ) to whom be was writing. The $\mu a \rho \tau \dot{v} \rho \iota o \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is the testimony relating to Christ ( $\mu$ a $\rho$. rou X $\rho$., i Cor. i. 6), the message of
 $\eta \gamma \delta \rho \in \nu \sigma \epsilon$, Theod.), delivered by the Apostle and his associates (gen. originis or causce efficientis, Scheuerl. Synt. § 17 , see notes on I Thess. i. 6), the destination of which is specified in the same enunciation ; comp. Col. i. 8,
 as here, the anarthrous prepositional member gives the whole clause a more complete unity of conception; see notes l.c., and Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 123. On the prep. $\epsilon \pi l$, which here seems to mark the mental direction of the $\mu a \rho \tau u ́ \rho l o \nu$ (comp. Luke ix. 5), and commonly involves some idea of 'nearness or approximation' (Donalds. Crat. $\S 1^{2} 2$ ), see Winer, $G r . \S 49.1, \mathrm{p} .363$ sq. kv $\tau \hat{n} \hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{f} \rho \mathrm{pa}$ ek. is most naturally
 which it is joined as a predication of time, reiterating and more precisely defining the foregoing temporal clause ot $\tau \alpha \nu \bar{\varepsilon} \theta_{\eta} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. Some of the older Vv., e.g. Syr., Ath., Goth., appear to have joined these words with what precedes, but are compelled either to regard the aor. $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau$. as equivalent to
 Syr.-Phil.) or to assign meanings to $\epsilon \nu$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu . \quad$ '́к., scil. 'de illo die,' Menoch., 'cum spe retributionis in illo die percipiendx,' Est., that are neither grammatically nor exegetically defensible. The position of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu_{\mathrm{c}} \dot{\epsilon} k$. is con-
fessedly somewhat unusual, but perhaps may have been designed to impress still more on the readers the exact and definite epoch when all was to be realized.
rt. Eis ob] 'Whereunto,' 'with expectations directed to which,' to its realization and fruition; not equivalent to $\delta{ }^{\prime}$ ' 8 (Auth., Schott), nor even to $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\ell} \rho \rho_{o ̈}$ (comp. De W.), but simply, with the primary force of the prep., definitive of the direction taken, as it were, by the longing prayers of the Apostle and his associates; see Winer, Gr. § 49. a, p. 354, Donalds. Cratyl. § 170 , and comp. Col. i. 29, but observe that the verb with which it is there associated ( $\kappa о \pi \iota \hat{\omega}$ ) gives the prep. a somewhat stronger and more definite meaning. $\quad к a l$ т $\left.\pi \rho \sigma \epsilon v \chi^{6} \mu \epsilon \theta a\right]$ ' we also pray;' besides merely longing or merely directing your hopes, we also avail ourselves of the definite accents of prayer, the kai gently contrasting the $\pi \rho o \sigma \varepsilon u x$. with the infusion of confidence and hope involved in the preceding words and especially echoed in the parenthetical member. On this use of kal, see notes on Phil. iv. I2, and on the use of $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ with $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon e^{\chi}$., see notes on I Thess. v. 25, and on
 'that God may count you worthy of your calling;' subject of the prayer blended with the purpose of making it ; toa having here, as not uncommonly in this combination, its secondary and weakened force; comp. Col. iv. 3, I Thess. iv. I, and notes on Eph. i. 17 , and on Phil. i. 9. The verb ḑtoồ occurs 7 times in the N. T. (Luke vii. 7, I Tim. v. 17, Heb. iii. 3, al.), and regularly in the sense of 'esteeming or counting delos' ('dignari,' Vulg. here,



Clarom.), not of making so (comp. Syr.
eñán Copt., al.), a meaning not lexically demonstrable; compare Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. The contrary is urged by Olsh., on the ground that tbe context shows that the call had been already received: $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$ however, though really the initial act (comp. i Thess. ii. 12), includes the Christian course which follows (Eph. iv. i), and its issues in blessedness
 $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \xi \epsilon \omega \nu \beta \epsilon \beta \alpha \iota o \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu, \eta ँ \tau \tau s$ каl $\kappa \cup p l \omega s$ к $\lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma i s$ E $\sigma \tau l$, Theoph., see notes on Phil. iii. 14, and comp. Reuss, Théol. Chret. iv. 15, Vol. 1I. p. 145.
 to completion, every good pleasure of goodness,' 'ut expleat omnem dulcedinem honestatis, h. e. ut plenam et perfectam, quầ recreemini, honestatem vobis impertiat,' Fritz. Rom. x. I, Vol. II. p. 372, note. The meaning of these words is not perfectly clear. The familiar use of $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta o \kappa \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$, evidocia, in ref. to God (Eph. i. 5, 9, Phil. ii. 13), suggests a similar reference in the present case (Wcum., Theoph. in part, Beng., al.) ; to this however there is ( I ) the exegetical objection that $\alpha \gamma_{a} \theta \omega \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta \eta$, though occurring 4 times in St Paul's Epp., is never applied to God, and (2) the more grave contextual objection that the second member $z_{\rho} \gamma o v \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$, equally undefined by any pronoun, certainly refers to those whom the A postle is addressing. It seems safest then to refer the present member to the Thessalonians; eijoкia marking the good pleasure they evinced, and
 jecti, Krüger, Sprachl. § 47.7. 1,--not of apposition, Alf.) the element in which it was so manifested, or more
exactly, the object to which the action implied in the derivative subst. was especially directed; see Scheuerl. Synt. § 17. I, p. $126 . \quad$ The attempt to refer the expression partly to God and partly to the Thess. (Olsh., comp. Theoph.), or to regard the operation of the believer and that of the Spirit as blended and confused (Jowett), is in a high degree precarious and unsatisfactory. On the meaning of édoкia, see the good note of Fritz. l. c. Vol. II. p. 369 sq ., and on the meaning of áyatcorivn (moral goodness) and its distinction from a $\gamma$ a $\theta o \partial t \eta s$, notes on Gal. v. 22.

६pyov $\pi$ [ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$ ] 'the work of faith,' the work which is the distinctive feature of it; ${ }^{\text {P }}$ yov being that which marks, characterizes, and evinces the vitality of the $\pi l \sigma \pi c s$, alnost 'the activity of faith,' not however merely as $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{v} \pi \sigma \mu o \nu \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\delta \omega \gamma \gamma \omega \hat{\omega}$, Theoph., but $\dot{v} \pi о \mu о \nu \dot{\eta} \nu$ as exhibited in the various circumstances of Christian life and duty. On the exact meaning and construction of these words, see notes on I Thess. i. 3, and comp. Reuss, Theol. Chrét. IV. ig, Vol. II. p. $205 . \quad$ év $\delta v v a ́ \mu \in i]$ ' with power,' i.e. powerfully,-specification of manner annexed to the verb $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma$, with which it is associated with a practically adverbial force; comp. Rom. i. 4, Col. i. 29, and see Bernhardy, Synt. v. 7, p. 209. The analogous use of $\sigma$ iv (comp. Scheuerl. Synt. § 22. b, p. 180) is not found in the N. T.
 the name...be glorified;' reiteration of the purpose (not merely result, Ev $\quad$ o$\xi a \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$, Theoph.) stated generally in verse 10 , in special reference to the converts of Thessalonica. It is not easy to define the exact difference be-




Be not disquieted concerning the Lord's coming. The Man of Sin. as ye know, must first
 $\tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \pi \alpha \rho o v \sigma i a s ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ K u \rho i o u ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{u}$ be revealed; and then shall be destroyed by the Lord.
tween the present use of $8 \pi \omega$ (used comparatively rarely by St Paul; only 6 times excluding quotations), and the corresponding one of lua. Speaking somewhat roughly, one may perhaps say that the relatival compound $\delta \pi \omega s$ (Donalds. Cratyl. § i96) involves some obscure reference to manner, while tya (appy. connected with the reflexive $\boldsymbol{Z}$, or the pronoun of the secoud person, comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 139) may retain some tinge of its primary referonce to locality. The real practical differences bowever are these, (a) that $8 \pi \omega s$ has often more of an eventual aspect; (b) that it is used with the future and occasionally associated with $\alpha \nu$,-both which constructions are inadmissible with the final tua; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 629 sq.
rd̀ oैvoua rov̂ Kup. is not a mere peripbrasis for $\dot{\delta}$ Kúplos, but specifies that character and personality as revealed to and acknowledged by men ; comp., but with caution, Bretschn. Lex. s. v. 6 , p. 29r, and notes on Phil. ii. to. The assertion of Jowett in loc. that these words have 'no specific meaning' cannot be sustained, and is language in every way to be regretted.
The addition X $\rho \stackrel{\sigma}{ }$ ô [Rec., Lachm. in brackets, with AFG; Vulg., Syr. (both) ; Chrys.] is rightly rejected by Tisch. with BDEKLN ; Clarom., Sangerm., Copt., Sahid., al.; Theod. (ms.),
 Him;' not in reference to $\boldsymbol{\tau} \delta \bar{\delta} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \boldsymbol{v}$ $\mathrm{K} v \rho$. (Lünem.), but to the immediately preceding 'I $\eta \sigma o 00$. The exact notion of reciprocity (comp. notes on Gal. vi.
14) would be best maintained by the former reference; but, as Alf. correctly observes, the present expression is used far too frequently and exclusively in ref, to union in our Lord Himself to admit here of any different applica. tion. кard $\tau \grave{\eta} \boldsymbol{v}$ Xápıv] ' in accordance with the grace;' the $\chi$ da $\rho$ s is tbe ' norma' according to which the glorification took place, and thence, by an intelligible transition, that of which it is regarded as a consequence;
 Gcum. ; comp. notes on кard on Phil. ii. 3, and Tit. iii. 5 . Tov̂ $\Theta \epsilon o v ̂$ $\eta^{\mu} \mu^{\omega} \nu \kappa$ к.т. $\lambda$.] This is one of the passages supposed to fall under Granville Sharpe's rule (comp. Middl. Gr. Art. p. 56, ed. Rose), according to which $\theta \epsilon \delta s$ and Kúpos would refer to the same person. It may be justly doubted however whether, owing to the peculiar nature of Kiplos (Winer, Gr. $\$ 19$. $\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{p}$. II3 $_{3}$, this can be sustained in the present case ; see esp. Middleton, p . 379 sq., and comp. Green, Gr. p. 216.
 ' Now we beseech you;' transition by means of the $\delta \boldsymbol{k} \mu \epsilon \tau a \beta \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \partial \nu$ (see notes on Gal. iii. 8) from the Apostle's prayers for his converts to what he claims of them, and the course of conduct be exherts them to follow. On the meaning of $\bar{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \hat{a} \nu$, see notes on I Thess. iv. I. intè is here certainly not introductory of a formula of adjuration (Vulg., perbaps Eth. [baenta,-often so used], Beza, al.), as such a meaning, though gram.


matically tenable (Bernhardy, Synt. v. 21, p. 244,-partially, but appy. without full reason, objected to by Winer), is by no means exegetically probable, and is without precedent in the language of the N.T. The more natural interpretation is to regard the prep. as approximating in meaning to $\pi \epsilon \rho t$ (Winer, Gr. § 47. 1, p. 343; comp. Kriger, Sprachl. §68.28. 3), but still distinct from it, as involving some trace of the idea of benefit to or furtherance of the mapoveia; comp. Wordsw. in loc., and see notes on Phil. ii. 13. The subject of the $\pi$ apougia had been misunderstood and misinterpreted, and its commodum therefore was what the Apostle wished to pro-
 'our gathering together unto Him,' scil. in the clouds of heaven, when He comes to judge the quick and dead; see I Thess. iv. i 7 , and comp. Matth. xxiv. 31, Mark xiii. 27. The subst. $\epsilon \pi \pi \iota \sigma v a \gamma \omega \gamma \grave{\eta}$ only occurs once again in the N.T. (Heb. x. 25), in ref. to Christian worship (comp. 2 Macc. ii. 7), and seems confined to later writers. The meaning assigned by Hammond, ' the greater liberty of the Christians to assemble to the service of Christ, the greater freedom of ecclesiastical assemblies,' is due to his reference of the present $\pi$ apougia rov̂ Kuplou to God's judgment on the Jews. The mutual relation of the two Epp. seems totally to preclude such a reference: if in 1 Thess. iv. is the words refer to the final day of doom (Hamm.), the allusion here nust certainly be the
 comp. Mark v. $2 \mathrm{I}, \sigma \cup \nu \dot{\eta} \chi \theta \eta \quad \delta \chi \lambda 0 s \pi b-$ $\lambda \dot{u} s \epsilon \pi^{\prime}$ aùrbu; the preposition marking the point to which the $\sigma v a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ was directed, and losing its idea of super-
position in that of approximation to or juxtaposition; comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 172 . The difference between $\pi \in \rho i$ and $\pi \rho o{ }^{s}$ in the present combination is perbaps no more than this, that while $\pi \rho \delta$ points rather to the direction to be taken, $\dot{\xi} \pi l$ marks more the point to be reached.
2. $\epsilon$ ls $\tau$ ò $\mu$ ń к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.] 'that ye should not be soon shaken,' 'ut non cito moveamini,' Vulg., Clarom. ; object and aim of the $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \hat{a} \nu$, with perbaps some included reference to the subject of it; comp. I Thess. iii. ro, and notes on in Thess. ii. I2. This construction though not found elsewhere with ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \tau \hat{q} \nu$ is perfectly intelligible. The verb $\sigma a \lambda \in \dot{u} \omega$, as its derivation shows [ $\sigma$ di ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{os}$, connected with AA•, and with Sanser. form sal, Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. r. p. 61], marks an agitated and disquieted state of mind, which in the present case was due to wild spiritual anticipations; compare Acts xvii. I3, and see exx. in Elsner, Obs. Vol. iI. p. 283. The $\tau a \chi \epsilon \omega s$ does not seem to refer to the period since St Paul was with them, or to the date of the First Epistle, but simply to the time when they might happen to hear the doctrine; the reference being rather nodal ('preecipitanter,' De W.) than purely temporal; 'si id crederent facili momento quassaretur ipsorum fides,' Cocceius. $\quad \mathbf{a} \pi \boldsymbol{\delta}$ tov̂ voós]' 'from your mind,' 'a vestro sensu,' Vulg.; certainly not ' $a$ sententiâ seu doctrinâ,' Est., but simply 'statu mentis solito,' Schott 1,-their ordinary, sober, and normal state of mind, $\pi a \rho a \tau \rho a \pi \hat{\eta} v a$,
 $\delta_{\rho} \theta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ i $\sigma \tau d \mu \epsilon \nu_{0 \nu}$, Theoph.; comp. Rom. xiv. 5, and Beck, Seelenl. § I8. I, p. 5 г. The construction is what is usually termed pregnane, scil. 'ita concuti ut'

##  

demovearis,' Schott; comp. Rom. vi. 7, ix. 3, 2 Tim. iv. 18 (els), al., and Winer, Gr. § 66. 2, p. 547 .
$\mu \eta \delta$ è $\theta$ poкiofar] 'nor yet be troubled;' stronger expression than the foregoing, introduced by the slightly ascensive $\mu \eta \delta \varepsilon$; see notes on I Thess. ii. 3 (Transl.). The verb $\theta \rho o \epsilon \in \omega$ [derived from $\theta$ PEOMAI, and connected with трt $\omega$; comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 272] properly denotes 'clamorem tumultuantem edere' (Schott), and thence, by a natural transition, that terrified state ( $\tau a \rho a \chi \zeta_{\zeta} \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, Zonaras), which is associated with and gives rise to such outward manifestations. In later writers $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\theta \rho o \eta \theta \hat{g} \rho$ comes to mean little more than $\mu \dot{\eta} \theta a \nu \mu \dot{d} \sigma \eta s$, Lobeck, Phryn. p. 676. The reading of Rec. $\mu \eta \tau \epsilon$ [with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$; several Ff.] is rightly rejected by Lachm. and Tisch. on the preponderating external authority of $\mathrm{ABD}^{1}$ (giving it also before $\delta<d \lambda_{o}$ jov $) \mathrm{F}$ (giving $\mu \eta \delta \notin$ thrice, but $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ with $\delta(a ̀$ lórou) GN ; Orig. The change from the disjunctive negative was probably suggested by the following $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, the true relation of the negatives not having been properly understood. $\quad \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \delta$ เd $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau о s]$ ' neither by spirit;' scil. of prophecy;

 тapovzos tô K.vplou, Theoph. The second negation is here, by means of the thrice repeated $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, divided into three members; see exx. and illustrations in Winer, $G r . \S 55.6, \mathrm{p} .437$, where the distinctive character of $\mu \eta \delta \xi$ and $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, their meaning, and sequence, are well delineated. $\quad \mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \boldsymbol{\delta} \mathbf{\iota} \mathbf{d}$ $\lambda$ óyou may be either regarded, (a) as an independent member distinguished both from what precedes and follows, or (b) may be connected more closely
with the third negative member, both being associated with $\omega$ s $\delta_{i} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. In the former case $\lambda$ doyou forms a species of antithesis to $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{a}$ os as denoting oral teaching, less marked by supernatural or prophetic characteristics
 Theoph.); in thelatter the $\lambda$ brov stands contrasted with $\epsilon \pi / \sigma \tau \sigma \lambda \hat{\eta}$, as marking what the Apostle had communicated by word of mouth in contradistinction to what he had written; $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi$ iotevécu


 Of these (b) seems slightly the most probable, especially as $\lambda \sigma_{\gamma}$ os and $\varepsilon^{\prime} \pi t$ : $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda \grave{\eta}$ are found similarly combined in ver. 15. To extend $\dot{\omega}^{\prime} \delta i_{i}^{i} \eta \mu \hat{\omega} y$ to the first clause, either partially (Jowett) or completely (Nösselt), seems illogical ; oral or written communications might be ascribed to the absent Apostle, but the $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ could only have been recognised as working in him ( De W.) when he was with them; comp. Lünem. in loc. $\quad \dot{\omega}_{s} \delta i^{\circ}$ $\left.\eta^{\dagger} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}\right]$ ' as (coming) through us,' represented to come from us as its mediate anthors; the ws as usual marking the erroneous aspects under which the $\lambda 6$ yos or $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \eta$ was designed to be regarded: 'particula ws substantivis participiis totisque enuntiationibus præposita rei veritate sublatâ aliquid opinione errore simulatione niti declarat,' Fritz. Rom. ix. 32, Vol. II. p. 360, comp. notes on Eph. v. 22. It seems impossible to understand these words otherwise, especially when coupled with the notice in ch. iii. $\mathrm{I}_{7}$, than as implying that not only oral but written communications, definitely ascribed to St Paul, were, not conceived (Jowett), but actually known by the

## 



Apostle to have been lately circulated in the Church of Thessalonica: кal
 Haúlov oràeloas éкúpouv à è $\lambda$ erov, Theoph., comp. Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 204 (Bohn). When we consider the extreme disquietude and anxieties that appear to have prevailed in this Church in ref. to the mapovola tô Kuplov, there appears nothing strange in the supposition that even within less time than a year since the A postle had last written fictitious letters should bave obtained currency anong them. To refer the expression with Hammond, al., to portions of the First Epistle which had been misunderstood seems distinctly to infringe on the simple meaning of
 'as that, to the effect that, the day of the Lord is now commencingl already come;' subject of the pretended communication introduced by is, which, as before, represents the statement not as actual, but as so represented, as the notion which was designed to be propagated; see Winer, Gr. § 65. 9, p. 544, Meyer on 2 Cor. xi. 21 , and exx. in Kypte, Obs. Vol. II. p. 268. The verb $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ is somewhat stronger than $\epsilon \phi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau$. (2 Tim. iv. 6), and seems to mark not only the nearness but the actual presence and commencement of the $\dot{\eta} \mu \notin \rho a \operatorname{\tau ov}$ K $\nu \rho$.; 'magna hoc verbo propinquitas significatur; nam $\epsilon \nu \in \sigma \tau \omega \bar{\omega}$ [Rom. viii. 38, I Cor. iii. 22] est prasens,' Beng., comp. notes on Gal. i. 4, Hammond in loc., and see the numerous exx. in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. Vol. i. p. 929. The $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ p a$ rô Kup. thus approximates in meaning to $\pi a \rho-$ ovala rô Kup., and like it includes, besides the exact epoch of the Lord's appearance, the course of events im-
mediately preceding and connected with it; comp. Reuss, Theol. Chret. iv. 21, Vol. II. p. 230, 243. For Kupiou Rec. reads Xpıotoú with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{~K}$; most mss.
 ceive you in any way;' not only in any of the three ways before specified (Theoph., Ecum.), but, with a more completely inclusive reference,-in any way, or by any artifice whatever;
 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \beta a \lambda e \nu \epsilon \ell \delta \bar{\delta}$, Theod. On the form k $\xi a \pi a r a ̂ \nu$, comp. notes on I Tim. ii.
 (the day will not arrive) unless there come;' slight grammatical irregularity owing to the omission of any member involving a finite verb (such as oú
 or $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \notin \rho a$ oíк $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a t)$ which can easily be supplied by the reader; see Winer, Gr. §64. I. 7, p. 528, comp. Donalds. Gr. § $583 . \beta$, note. The most natural punctuation is not a comma before $\delta \tau \iota$, as in Lachm., Tisch., Buttm., but a colon, as in Mill, and as suggested by Lünemann.
ท่ $\mathbf{~ d} \pi \sigma \sigma \mathrm{ra} \mathrm{\sigma}[\mathrm{a}]$ ' the falling away,' the definite religious apostasy that shall precede the coming of Antichrist, and of which it is not improbable that the Apostle had informed them by word of mouth; see ver. 5 , and comp. Green, Gram. p. 155. It is hardly necessary to say that $\dot{a} \pi о \sigma \tau a \sigma l a$ is not an abstract for a concrete term (aỉ $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\nu \nu} \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\imath}$ тòv àvtiरpıбтov à $\pi о \sigma \tau a \sigma i a \nu$, Chrys.; so Theod., Theoph., Ecum. I), nor again a political (Nösselt) or politico-religious (Kern) falling away, whether past or future, but simply, in accordance with what seems to be the regular use of the word (Acts xxi. 2 f , comp. 2 Chron. xxix. 19, I Macc. ii. I5), that

## 

religious and spiritual apostasy ('diabolicam apostasiam,' Iren. adt. Hoer. v. 25. I), that falling away from faith
 of which the revelation of Antichrist shall be the concluding and most appalling phenomenon; comp. Luke xviii. 8. The paulo-post future view, according to which the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau a \sigma l a$ refers to the revolt of the Jews from the Romans (Schoettg. Hor. Hebr. Vol. r. p. 840), is thus opposed to the probable technical meaning of the word, while that of Hammond, who mainly refers it to the lapse to Gnosticism, fails to exhibit its generic reference, and to exhaust its prophetic significance. On the form of the word, a later form for a $\pi \bar{\pi} \sigma \tau a \sigma t s$, see Lobeck, Phryn. p. $5^{28}$.
стокалифөй] 'be revealed,'-a very noticeable expression: as the Lord's coming is characterized as an áжoкá$\lambda \nu \psi / s$ (ch. i. 7), so is that of Antichrist. As He is now spiritually present in His Church, to be personally revealed with more glory hereafter, even so the power of Antichrist is now secretly at work, but will hereafter be made manifest in a definite and distinctive bodily personality. The sal bas here appy. its consecutive force (see notes on I Thess. iv. I); the revelation of Antichrist was the aggravated issue of the $\dot{a} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau a \sigma l a$.
ó ávep. rîs ápaptlas]'the man of Sin,' the fearful child of man (obs. the distinct term äv $\nu \rho$.) of whom $\operatorname{Sin}$ is the special characteristic and attribute, and in whom it is as it were impersonated and incarnate; d $d v \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma$


 retav, Theod. On this gen. of the 'predominating quality,' which is com-
moniy classed under the general head of the gen. possessivus, see Scheuerlein, Synt. § 16. 3, p. 1 15, Winer, Gr. §34. 3.b, p. 211 sq. For ápaptlas, BN; Io mess. read àvoulas. ó viòs tîs $\mathbf{\alpha} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. .] 'the son of perdition;' he who stands in the sort of relation to it that a son does to a father, and who falls under its power and domination, 'cujus finis est interitus,' Cocceius [Phil. iii. ig]; see John xvii. i2, where this awful name is given to Judas, and comp. Evang. Nicod. cap. 20, where it is applied to Satan; see Thilo, p. 708. The transitive (Pelt), or mixed trads. and intransitive meaning ( $\omega$ s

 (Ecum.), seems to be phraseologically doubtful ; comp. Winer, Gr. $\$ 34 \cdot 3 . \mathrm{b}$, p. ${ }^{21} 3$, and notes on 1 Thess. v. 5 .
4. ó dेтькє [ $\mu \mathrm{evos}$ ] 'he that opposeth,'
 [qui adversarius est] Syr., comp. Copt., ※th. ; participial substantive defining more nearly the characteristics of Antichrist; comp. Winer, $G r$. § $45 \cdot 7$, p. 316. The adversary, though assimilating one of the distinctive features of Satan ( be confounded with him whose agent and emissary he is (ver. 9), but, in accordance with the almost uniform tradition of the ancient Church, is Antichrist,-no mere set of principles ('vis spiritualis evangelio contraria,' Pelt) or succession of opponents (Jowett, comp. Middl. Gr. Art. p. 383 , and Wordsw. in loc.), but one single personal being, as trulyman as He whom he impiously opposes: tis $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$ oûtós

 $\tau \eta \nu \nu$ t $\nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota a \nu$, Chrys., see Wieseler, Chronol. p. 26I, Hofmann, Schriftb.

## 

II. 2, Vol. II. p. 617. The patristic references will be found in the Excursus of Lünem. p. 204, and at length in Alford, Prolegom. on this Epistle. The object of the opposition ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau<\kappa \in(\mu$.$) ,$ it need scarcely be said, can be none other than Christ,-He whose blessed name is involved in the more distinctive title ( $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{i}$ (Xportos) of the adversary, and to whom that son of perdition, as Origen well says, is кard ס¿áuєт $\rho a \nu$ èvadtios, contra Cels. vi. 64. The present grammatical connexion, which (see above) is as old as Syr., is rightly adopted by De W., Lünem., and most modern commentators: the absence of the art., urged by Pelt,
 $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a, \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. is not a different person from the ${ }^{\text {a }} \nu \tau \iota \kappa \epsilon i_{\mu} \mu \nu \rho s$, but by no means specifies that both are to be united in connexion with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ máv $\quad$ ка $\quad \tau . \lambda$.; comp. Winer, Gr. § 19. 4, 5, p. 116 sq. In a case like the present the article really performs a kind of double duty; it serves to turn duviк. into a subst., and also indicates that the two participles refer to the same in-
 ' and (who) exalteth himself above (and against) every" one called God,' scil. every one so called, whether 'eum qui verissime dicitur Deus' (Schott), or those esteemed so by the heathen; the participle being prefixed to avoid the appearance of placing on a level or including in a common designation $\tau \partial \nu \Theta \epsilon \partial \nu$ and the so-called gods of paganism ; comp. I Cor. viii. 5, $\lambda \epsilon$ үó$\mu \epsilon \nu O \epsilon \theta \epsilon 0$, Eph. ii. II. The verb $\dot{v} \pi \in \rho a, \rho$. occurs (probably) twice in 2 Cor. xii. 7 , and serves to mark the haughty exaltation ( $\dot{\psi \omega \omega \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a l ~ k a i}$
 $\lambda a \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon!\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \gamma к a$, Dan. xi. 36, Theod.), while $\epsilon \pi l$ with its general local mean-
ing ('supra,' Vulg., 'ufar,' Goth.) of 'motion with a view to superposition' (Donalds. Gr. § 483 ) involves the more specific and ethical one of opposition: comp. Matth. x. 2 I , and Winer, Gr. § 49. l, p. $3^{6} 3 \mathrm{sq}$.
 teristic of impious exaltation is in such striking parallelism with that ascribed by Daniel to 'the king that shall do according to his will' (ch. xi. 36), that we can scarcely doubt that the ancient interpreters were right in referring both to the same person,-Antichrist. The former portion of the prophecy in Daniel is appy. correctly referred to Antiochus Epiphanes, but the concluding verses (ver. 36 sq .) seem only applicable to him of whom Antiochus was merely a type and shadow; comp. Jerome on Dan. xi. 2r, and see Prideaux, Connection, Part ir. Book 3 (ad fin.). If this be correct, we may be justified in believing that other types of Antichrist may have appeared, and may yet appear before that fearful Being finally come. If asked to name them, we shrink not from pointing to this prophecy, and saying that in whomsoever these distinctive features he found-whosoever wields temporal, or temporal and spiritual power, in any degree similar to that in which the Man of Sin is here described as wielding it-he, be he pope or potentate, is beyond all doubt a distinct type of Antichrist. From such comparisons the wisest and most Catholic writers have not deemed it right to shrins; see Andrewes, Serm. vi. Vol. Iv. p. 146 sq., and compare the reff. at the end of Wordsworth's long and important note on this pas. sage. $\quad \eta \quad \sigma \in \beta a \sigma \mu a]$ ' or object of worship,' sciL of divine worship,a further definition appended to $\theta \epsilon \dot{\nu}$.

## 

The special interpretation of Bengel, founded on the connexion of $\sigma \epsilon \beta a \sigma \mu \alpha$ and $\sigma \epsilon \beta a \sigma \tau \delta s$, 'Cessaris majestas et potestas Romæ maxime conspicua,' is wholly at variance with the prevailing use of the word (Acts xvii. 23, Wisdom xiv. 20, xv. ${ }_{17}$, Bel 27 [Theod.], see Suicer, Thesaur. 8.v. Vol. II. p. 942), and still more so with the generic terms of the prophecy.
జ̈бTє aủrd̀...ka0.]'so that he sitteth down:' his arrogance rises to such an impious height as to lead to this uttermost act of unholydaring; ' ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon$ minus hic consilium quam sequelam innuere videtur,' Pelt. The verb кäiбat is here not transitive (r Cor. vi. 4, Eph. i. 20), but in accordance with its nearly regular usage in the N. T. intransitive; comp. Thom.-Mag. p. 486 (ed. Bern.). The pronoun is thus not reflexive (Grot.), but is introduced and placed prominently forward to mark theindividualizing arrogance ('hicipse, qui quævis sancta et divina contemnit,' Schott) of this impious intruder. The interpolation after $\Theta \epsilon \sigma \hat{0}$ of $\dot{\omega} s \theta \epsilon \dot{\partial}$, adopted by Rec. with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}\left(\mathrm{FG}^{1}\right.$ iva $\theta$. .) ; mss.; Syr., Syr.-Phil. with an asterisk, Ar.(Pol.) ; Chrys., al., is rightly rejected by Lachm., Tisch., with A BD1N; 10 mss. ; Clarom., Sangerm., Augiens., Boern., Vulg., Goth. (?), Copt., Sah., Æth., Arm. ; Origen (3), and many Ff. C is deficient.
eis Tòv vaìv tove $\Theta_{\epsilon 0 \text { û] ] ' in the temple }}$ of God' (the 'adytum' itself, not the mere $l_{\epsilon \rho} \delta \nu$ ), literally 'into,' with the not uncommon pregnant force of the preposition in connexion with $t \xi \in L$, $\kappa a \theta \epsilon \xi \in \sigma \theta a l$ к. $\tau . \lambda$; ; comp. Winer, $G r$. §50. 4, p. $3^{68}$ sq., Buttm. Mid. p. 175 . The exact meaning of these words has been greatly contested. Are they (a) merely a figurative or metaphorical expression (I Cor. iii. 17, comp. Eph.
ii. 2 r) for the Church of Christ, $\tau \mathbf{d} \mathrm{s}$ таитаХо仑 $\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a s$ (Chrys.), according to the views of most of the interpreters of the fourth century? Or do they refer to ( $b$ ) the actual temple of God at Jerusalem (Matth. xxvi. 6I), which prophecy seems to declare may be restored (Ezek. xxxvii. 26; see Todd on Antichr. p. 218), as proposed by Irenæus(Hcer. v. 30.4), and as adopted, though with varying modes of explanation, by the majority of recent German commentators? If we are called on to decide absolutely, the combination (opp. to Alf.) of local terms and the possibly traditional nature of the interpr. of Irenæus must decidedly sway us to (b). It may be asked however whether in so wide a prophecy we are wise in positively excluding (a). May it not be possible that a haughty judicial or dictatorial session in the Church of Christ may be succeeded by and culminate in a literal act of ineffable presumption to which the present words may more immediately though not exclusively refer? Combined or partially combined interpretations are ever to be regarded with suspicion, but in a prophecy of this profound nature they appear to have some claim on our attention. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \mathbf{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\delta} \mathrm{\epsilon Lkv} \mathbf{v} v \tau \alpha$ к.т.入.] ' $e x h i b i t i n g ~ h i m s e l f ~ t h a t ~ h e ~ i s ~$ God;' not merely 'a god,' Copt., or even 'tamquam sit Deus,' Vulg. (com-
 [quod sit Deus] Syr.-Pbil.,-with a studied reference to the execrable assumption of an unconditioned glory, dignity, and independence, which will characterize the God-opposing session of the son of perdition: so, with an effective paraphrase, Æth. 'et dicet omnibus Ego sum Deus.' The participle thus does not mark the 'cona-
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tus' ( $\pi \in \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \nu$ àmoঠeєкvúval, Chrys.), -this must be from the nature of the case,--but the continuing nature of the act, the impious persistence of this developed outcoming of frightful and intolerable selfishness; see Müller on Sin, Book I. 3. 2, Vol. I. p. I45, comp. Book v. Vol. II. p. 480 (Clark). For examples of this use of anoסєєкvúvac, see Loesner, Obs. p. $38_{4}$, and for the force of the compound aं $\pi 0 \delta$. ('spectandum aliquid proponere'), Winer, de Verb. Comp. iv. p. 16.
5. Oиं $\mu v \eta \mu$ оує́єтє] • Remember ye not ;' emphatic, reminding them, with some degree of implied blame, of the definite oral communications which had been made to them during the Apostle's first visit; $l \overline{\delta o u ̀ ~ \gamma ~} \dot{\alpha} \rho$ кal $\pi a \rho$.

 mpds $\mathbf{v} \mu \mathrm{a} s$ ] ' with you; so I Thess. iii. 4. On this combination of $\pi \rho \delta{ }^{2}$ with the acc. and verbs implying rest, see notes on Gal. i. 8, iv. 18. The $\tau \alpha \hat{u} \tau a$ is clearly the substance of the two preceding verses.
 now what restraineth ye know.' The difficulty of these words is twofold, (I) lexical, turning on the meaning of $\nu 0 \hat{y}$, (2) exegetical, in reference to the explanation that is to be given of $\tau \delta$ кarexoy. With regard to the first, the temporal particle subsequently connected 'with $\dot{\delta} \kappa a \tau \epsilon \chi$ (ver. 7), and the preceding ${ }^{2} \tau \iota$ (ver. 5), both seem to suggest the temporal use of vôv (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 259 note); the order of the words however and the context are so very distinctly in favour of the logical use (Hartung, Partik. $\nu \hat{\text { û, 2. 2, Vol. if. p. 25, see }}$ notes on I Thess. iii. 8), that on the whole that meaning is to be preferred;
see esp. Lünem. in loc. who has appy. brought valid arguments against the temporal meaning. To investigate (2) properly would far outstrip the limits of this commentary. I may however say briefly-that after most anxious consideration I believe that a modification of the current patristic view is much the most plausible interpretation. The majority of these early writers referred the restraining influence to the Roman Empire, 'quis nisi Romanus status?' Tertull. de Resurr. cap. 24: so Chrys., Theoph., Ecum., Cyril of Jerus., al. In its literal meaning this cannot now be sustained without artificial and unhistorical assumptions: if however we refer the $\tau \delta$ кatєXoy to what really formed the groundwork of that inter-pretation-the restraining power of well-ordered human rule, the principles of legality as opposed to those of à oula-of which the Roman Empire was the then embodiment and manifestation, we shall probably not be far from the real meaning of this very mysterious expression. Of the numerous other views, we may notice the opinion of Theod. and Theod.Mops., that the $\tau \dot{o}$ кacé $\chi^{o \nu}$ is $\dot{o} \tau 0 \hat{v}$ Өєồ ofoos, as certainly being at first sight plausible ; but to this the $\varepsilon^{\prime} \omega \mathrm{c} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mathrm{k}$ $\mu \epsilon \sigma o v \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \tau a \iota$ introduces an objection that seems positively insuperable. Further information will be found in the Excursus of Pelt (who however adopts the view of Theod.), p. 185 sq., in the thoughtful note of Olsh., the discussion of Lünem. p. $2 \mathrm{O}_{4}$ sq., the useful summary of Alford, Prolegom. on this Epistle, and the good note of Wordsw. in loc.; comp. also Hofmann, Schriftb. II. 2, Vol. II. p. $6{ }_{1}{ }_{3}$ sq. els тd $\dot{\alpha} \pi о к а \lambda$ ] 'that
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he should be revealed;' purpose contemplated in the existence of the restraining principle. This \& \&тoкádvyts was not to be immediate (ởк $\epsilon โ \pi \epsilon \nu$ ठ̈ $\tau \iota$
 but was to be deferred till the $\delta$ tavтố kalpos,-the season appointed and ordained by God. On the correct insertion of $\epsilon$, see notes on Eph. ii. 12 .
7. Td $\gamma \mathrm{\alpha} \rho \mu \nu \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho$. к.т. $\lambda$.] 'For the mystery of lawlessness;' confirmatory explanation of the preceding statement: the mystery of lawlessness is truly at work; but its full manifestation cannot take place till the removal of the restraining power. On this blending of the explanatory and argumentative forces of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ d $\rho$, see Dotes on I Thess. ii. I.

The meaning of $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{-}$ ptov $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ dvou. is sonewhat doubtful. Considered merely grammatically, the gen. does not seem to be that of the agent (Theod.), or that of apposition (Liunem., and Alf. - who however seems to mix it up with a gen. continentis), but simply a gen. definitivus (comp. Madvig, Synt. § 49) or gen. of the 'characterizing principle or quality' (Scheuerl. Synt. § г6. 3, p. 115), -the mystery of which the characterizing feature, or, so to say, the active principle, is d.voula; comp. Joseph. Bell. Jud. 1. 24. 1, $\tau \partial \nu$ 'Аעтı $\pi$ át $\rho o v$
 $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho l a y$. The transition from this gen. to that of ethical content is so easy and natural, that it is often dimcult to decide whether the gen. belongs to that category or to that of the possess. gen.; see Scheuerl. l.c. The genitival relation of $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \tau^{\prime} \rho . \tau \hat{\eta} s$ cúveßelas is often somewhat plausibly contrasted with the present expression (Andrewes, Serm. III. Vol. I. 34), but really seems to be different; see notes
on I Tim. iii. 9 . This mystery
 christ, or any real or assumed type
 Chrys.), but all that mass of uncombined and so to say unorganized ávo$\mu i a$, which, though at present seen only in detail and not revealed in its true proportions, is even now ( $\check{\eta} \delta \bar{\eta}$ ) aggregating and energizing, and will
 complete development and organization in the person and power of Antichrist. On the meaning of $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \eta_{\rho}$, — here placed emphatically forward as standing in tacit antithesis to ámoка$\lambda u \phi \theta$. ver. 6, 8,-see notes on Eph. r. $3^{2}$, and comp. Sanderson, Serm. Ix. (ad Aul.), Vol. I. p. 227 (ed. Jacobs.). '̇vєрүєital] 'is working,' 'operatur,' Vulg., ${ }^{\text {àn }}$ pit efficax esse], Syr., comp. Жth.; clearly not passive, 'efficax redditur' (Schott), which would not only be here inappropriate but is opposed to the prevailing use of the word in the N.T.; see notes on Gal. v. 6, and on the different constructions of the word, notes on $i b$. ii. 8. In the middle it stands either absolutely or followed by $\dot{\epsilon} \nu . \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ d̀voplas] 'lawlessness ;' in appropriate and illustrative antithesis to the principle of order and legality involved in the probable meaning of ro катє $\chi^{\nu} \nu$. On the meaning of à ópila ('in quâ cogitaturpotissimum legem non servari,' Tittm.) and its distinction from dं $\delta \kappa \kappa l a$, see Tittm. Synon. I. p. 48, Trench, Synon. Part II. § 16 , and notes on Tit. ii. 14 .
 that now restraineth shall have been removed;' rhetorical change of the usual order; see exx. in Winer, $G r$. § 6 r. 3,
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p. $4^{85}$, and comp. Gal. ii. 10, $\mu$ óvoy $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \tau \omega \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \quad$ iva $\mu \nu \eta \mu \nu \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, where the emphatie words are similarly attached to the semi-elliptical $\mu \delta y^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu$. As however in Gal. l.c. so here it is not necessary to supply definitely any verb to complete the ellipsis ('tantum ut qui tenet nunc teneat,' Vulg., comp. Auth.), still less to connect $\mu \dot{b} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ with what precedes (Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 342). The $\mu \dot{\partial}{ }^{2} \nu$ helongs to ${ }^{\ell} \omega s$, and simply states the limitation involved in the present working of the $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \neq \frac{\tau}{\eta} \hat{\eta} \mathrm{a}$ avouias: it is working already, but only with unconcentrated action until the obstacle be removed, and Antichrist be revealed. So rightly as to structure Chrys., $\dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}$ ' $\mathrm{P} \omega$ -
 $\eta$ $\eta \xi \epsilon$. The only other plausible structure is the supplement of $\varepsilon \sigma \tau \iota$, but the objection of Lünem., that in the present case a word of such real importance could scarcely be omitted, seems reasonable and valid. The greatest difficulty however is the change of gender in the designation of the restraining principle. Perhaps the simplest view is to regard it, not as a studied designation of a single individual (e.g. St Paul, Schott, p. 249), or of a collection of such (e.g. the saints at Jerusalem, Wieseler, Chronol. p. 273, or, more plausibly, the succession of Roman Emperors, W ordsw.), but merely as a realistic touch, by which what was previously expressed by the more abstract $\tau \delta$ кa $\tau \epsilon \chi \begin{aligned} & \\ & \nu\end{aligned}$ now represented as concrete and personified; comp. Rom. xiii. 4, where the personification is somewhat similarly introduced after, and elicited from, a foregoing abstract term ( $\bar{\xi} \xi o v-$ $\sigma i a \nu)$. $\quad$ aprt is to be closely connected with $\dot{\delta} \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \chi \omega \nu$, and simply refegs to time regarded as present to
the writer. On the derivation and meaning of the word, see notes on I Thess. iii. 6.
 nexion of $\xi^{\prime} \omega s$ with the subjunctive without $\alpha \mu$, ,a construction especially characteristic of later writers, see Winer, Gr. §41. 3, p. 266. The distinction acutely drawn by Herm. (de Partic. äy, II. 9, p. Iog) between such formulæ as $\mu \mu \nu \nu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \omega s$ dá $\nu \omega$ (de moribundo) and ${ }^{\prime \prime} \omega s$ à $\nu \quad \theta a ́ \nu \omega$ (de eo qui non ita propinquam sibi putaret mortem esse) and repeated by Klotz (Devar. Vol. 1I. p. 568) cannot with safety be applied in the N.T.; nor can we with distinct probability ascribe the omission of $a \nu$ to any idea of design supposed to be involved in the sentence (it is actually inserted here by FG), as suggested by Green, Gram. p. $6_{4}$, note. We have only an instance of that obliteration of finer shades of distinction which characterizes the later and decadent Greek. The phrase $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma o v \gamma^{\prime} \gamma \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ is illustrated by Wetstein and Kypke (Obs. Vol. il. p. 343) : it indicates the removal of any obstacle, of anything $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \varphi{ }^{8} \nu \quad$ (Xen. Cyrop. v. 2. 26, cited by Lünem.), leaving the manner of the removal wholly undefined; comp. $\dot{a} \rho \theta \hat{\eta} \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \mu \hat{\epsilon} \sigma o v \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, I Cor. v. 2, $\hat{\eta} \rho \tau a t \epsilon \kappa \tau o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \sigma o u$, Isaiah lvii. 2.
8. kal тótє] 'and then,' - then when $\dot{o} \kappa a \tau \epsilon \chi \chi \nu$ shall have been removed; the primary emphasis clearly falling on the particle of time, the secondary and subordinate on $\dot{a} \pi о к а-$ $\lambda \nu \phi \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha l . \quad \delta \quad$ övo lawless one;' identical with the foregoing $\dot{o} a^{\prime} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma s \hat{\eta}_{s} \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau$., the changing designation serving appropriately to echo the preceding term ( ${ }^{2} \mathbf{v o \mu l a}$ ), which defines more nearly the evil principle that the Man of Sin will
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 $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$; mss., Ff. C is deficient. In spite of the possibility of conformation to Isaiah xi. 4, it seems best to retain the reading to which so great a preponderance of MS. authority points.
especially develop: 'Exlex ille qui nullis legum vinculis coerceri vult, sed omnia jura divina et humana suo ipsius arbitrio subjicit,' Vorst, ap. Pol. Syn.
óv ó Kúplos к.т.入.] ' whom the Lord Jesus shall consume with the breath of His mouth;' relative sentence describing, with a consolatory glance forward to the final issue, the ultimate fate of Antichrist; каl $\tau \mathfrak{l} \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a}$ тầтa; $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \dot{v} s \dot{\eta} \pi a \rho a-$
 Chrys. The forcible expression $\tau \hat{\psi}$ $\pi \nu \epsilon u ́ \mu$. тô̂ $\sigma \tau \delta \mu$. aú $\tau \hat{v}$ has received different explanations. It has been referred (a) by the Greek commentators to the words of power ( $\phi \theta \epsilon \gamma \xi \epsilon$ eral $\mu$ о́ $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ у, Chrys.; comp. Theod., Theod.Mops., al.) issuing from the Lord's lips; (b) by Athan. (ad Serap. 1. 6, p. 655), Theoph. 2, al., to the Holy Spirit; but is most simply regarded (c) as a vivid declaration of the glorious and invincible power of the coming Lord, 'cui sufficiat halitus oris quo $d^{2} \nu o \mu o s$ ille perdatur;' Schott; comp. Isaiah xi. 4 (from which these words may have been derived), Wisdom xi. 20, 2 I , and the pertinent quotations from Rabbinical writers collected by Wetst. in loc. : on the word кaлap $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \omega$, comp. notes on Gal. v. 4. The reading is hardly doubtful: $\dot{\dot{o}} \mathrm{~K} v \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma 0$ ôs is supported by ADE ${ }^{1} \mathrm{FGL}^{2} \boldsymbol{N}$; Io mss. : Syr. (both), Vulg., al. Rec. omits 'Inoous with $\mathrm{BE}^{2} \mathrm{KL}^{1}$; most miss. ; Arab. (Pol.) ; Orig., al. $\mathbf{C}$ is
deficient. $\quad \tau \hat{n}$ érıфavela
Tท̂s map. av่тov] 'with the manifestation of His coming;' not with a semitheological reference to the glorious manifestation ('inlustratione,' Vulg., 'brightness,' Auth., 'vi salutari,' Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 343) of Christ at His second coming (comp. notes on г Tim. vi. 14, and Tit. ii. s3, where $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta o ́ \xi \eta s$ is definitely added), but with simple reference to H is visible coming (' aspectu adventus sui,' Clarom., Eth.) and actual local appearing; $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ r \eta \nu \kappa \alpha i \phi a \nu \epsilon i s \mu \delta \nu o \nu$, Chrys., Theoph.
 the time and subject of Antichrist's coming, after the anticipatory allusion to his final overthrow; the oú resuming and re-echoing the $\hat{\rho} \nu$ of verse 8. The ethical present $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$ marks the certainty of the future event; see Winer, Gr. §40. 2, p. 237, Bernhardy, Synt. x. 2, p. 37 I. The instant repetition of rapougla in the new connexion is remarkable.

кат’ $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} v \in \mathfrak{p} \gamma$. то̂ इat.] 'according to the working of Satan;' not here 'in consequence of ' (DeW., comp. notes on ch. i. I2), but, in accordance with the more usual force of кatá, 'in agreement and correspondence with' an $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} p \gamma \epsilon \epsilon a$ sttch as belongs to and might be looked for from Satan; comp. notes on Eph. i. 19, and Col. i. 29. The remark of Bengel is full of deep thought,-_'ut ad Deum se habet Christus, sic e contrario ad Satanam se habet Anti.


christus．＇
$\delta_{\nu \nu \alpha} \mu$ ．к．т．入．］＇in all power and signs and wonders of lying，＇－in every form of（see notes on Eph．i．8）power， signs，and wonders，leading to and tending to develop $\psi \epsilon \hat{i} \delta o s: \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ being no＇nota dativi＇（Olsh．），but marking the sphere and domain of this［oं $\alpha \tau t]$ rapovala（comp．notes on I Thess．i． 5），and both $\pi \dot{a} \sigma \eta$（comp．Winer，$G r$ ． § 59．5，p．466）and the gen．being associated with all the three substan－ tives．The exact nature of the geni－ tival relation is not perfectly certain： $\psi$ eúdous may be regarded as（a）a gen． of the origin，（b）of the characterizing quality or essence（see notes on ver． 7），or lastly，（c）of＇the point of view＇（Scheuerl．Synt．§ 18，p．129）． Of these（ $a$ ）is by no means probable； but between（b）and（c）it is very diff－ cult to decide．Perhaps the object specified in ver．II，and the analogy of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \dot{\partial} \dot{\delta} \delta x i a s$（ver．ro），scil．＇fraus quæ ad improbitatem spectat＇（Schott I，Winer，Gr．§ 30．2．$\beta$ ，p．170），may here incline us to the latter；so Chrys． 2，$\epsilon i s$ more lax connexions of the gen．，see Winer，Gr．l．c．
The three substantives might seem to be climactic；it was not only in an element of power（see notes on I Thess． i．s），but one of signs，and further one of prodigies，that the working of Satan took place；as however we find a varied order（Acts ii．22），and as the difference between $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i a$（＇res inso－ litas quibus Deus aliquid significet，＇ Fritz．）and $\tau$ tpara（＇quæ ut inusitata observari soleant，＇ib．）exists less in the things themselves than in the mode of regarding them，we may perhaps most naturally consider the substantives as studiedly accumulated so as to give
force and expansion to the description； compare Bornemann，Schol．in Luc． p．xxx．On the meaning of the last two words，and the derivation of $\tau \in \rho a s$ ［ $\tau \eta p \epsilon \omega$ ，comp．Benfey，Wurzellex．Vol． 11．p．238］，see the elaborate note of Fritz．Rom．xv．19，Vol．III．p． 270. The form $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i o \nu$ appears closely con－ nected with $\sigma \hat{\eta} \mu a(\theta \eta \mu a \tau-)$ ，and thence with ©en，ti $i \neq \mu$ ；see Pott，Etym． Forsch．Vol．11．p． 592.

10．кal év $\pi a^{\prime} \sigma_{\eta}$ к．т．$\left.\lambda.\right]$＇and in all （every kind of）deceit of iniquity；＇ generic and comprehensive term ap－ pended by the collective кal to the foregoing list of more special details； comp．Winer，Gr．§ 53.3 ，p． $3^{88, ~ a n d ~}$ notes on Phil．iv． 12 ．On the geni－ tival relation，see above，ver． 9 ，and Winer，Gr．§30．2，p．170，and on the meaning of ḋठıкla（＇de quâcunque im． probitate dicitur quatenus $\tau \hat{\psi} \delta \iota \kappa a i \varphi$ repugat，＇Tittm．），notes on 2 Tim． ii．r9．The reading of Rec．$\tau \hat{\eta} s$ d $\delta$ ．［with DEKLN ${ }^{4}$ ；mss．；Hippol．， Chrys．，Theod．］is rejected by Lachm． and Tisch．on the higher authority of ABFGN ${ }^{1}$ ；mss．；Orig．（6），Cyr．－ Jer．toîs àmo入入u－ $\left.\mu^{\hat{k}} \mathrm{voss}\right]$＇for those that are perishing；＇ dat．incommodi，belonging to the gene－ ral head of the dative of interest；see Krüger，Sprachl．§ 48．4．The more exactly specifying roîs àmo $\lambda \lambda$ ．has no reference to any＇decretum reproba－ tionis＇（comp．even Pelt，＇damnationi a Deo devoti＇），but either like $\begin{gathered} \\ \sigma \\ \text { i }\end{gathered}$ marks the certainty of the event（＇qui certissime sunt perituri，＇Turret．），or perhaps more simply，with merely a temporal parallelism，points to those who＇are perishing＇at the time in contemplation，－not too without re－ ference to the present existence（comp． ver．7）of such a class（I Cor．i．18，
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${ }_{2}$ Cor. ii. 15 , iv. 3), of which those here specified will be the continuance and development. The consolatory nature of the tacit limitation is not overlooked by the Greek commentators; $\mu \grave{\eta}$ фо३ $\eta \theta \hat{\eta} s$ à $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \epsilon$, à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ äkovє

 ${ }^{2} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$, Chrys. ' $\mathrm{E} \nu$ is prefixed to $\tau 0 i \hat{s}$ वiто $\lambda \lambda$. by Rec. but only on the authority of $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL} \mathbf{N}^{4}$; mss.; Syr. (both) ; Orig. (I), al.
à $\theta^{\prime}$ © $\mathbf{\omega v}$ ] 'for that,' 'in requital for that' ( $\tau \ell$ oviv $\tau \delta$ к $\kappa \in \rho \delta o s ;$ Chrys.), Luke i. 20, xii. 3 , xix. 44, Acts xii. 23 , comp. Lev. xxiv. 20 ; explanatory statement of the cause of the judicial dispensation of God, and of the justness and deservedness of their punishment. On this meaning of $\alpha^{\prime} \nu \theta^{\prime} \dot{\omega}^{\prime} \nu$ ('propterea quod'), see Herm. Viger, No. 33, Winer, Gr. § 47. a, p. 326, and for exx. see the list collected by Wetst. on Luke i. 20, and Raphel, Annot. Vol. I. p. 442. $\quad \tau \eta े \nu$ áyá $\pi \eta \nu \tau \eta ิ s a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta$.] ' the love of the truth;' not 'charitatem veram,' Anselm (cited by Corm. a Lap.), but 'the love felt for the truth,' 'dilectionem veritatis,' Pseud.-Ambr.,a $\lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \theta$. not being a gen. of quality, but the simple and common gen. objecti; comp. Winer, Gr. § 30, p. 167, Krüger, Sprachl. § 47. 7. I sq. 'H $\dot{a} \lambda \gamma \theta \epsilon \iota a$ is opposed to tò $\psi \in \hat{\text { ôdos }}$ (ver. ir). It seems somewhat perverse in Jowett to deny that this implies any higher degree of alienation from the truth than the less distinctive oúk $\overline{\epsilon \delta \xi \xi a \nu \tau 0 \tau \dot{\eta} v}$ $\dot{d} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon(a v$ : surely it is one thing not to receive the truth,-an unhappy state that might be referable to a mental obliquity for which some excuse might be found,-and another to receive no love of it, to be open to no desire to seek it, to be worse than indifferent
to it; ' ubi veritas summopere amabilis, ibi se quodammodo amor veritatis insinuat,' Cocceius. The prosopopœia
 adopted by Theod., Theoph., and Ecum., is artificial, and unsupported
 aủroús] 'that they might be saved;' object that would bave been naturally contemplated in their reception of it; and which was disregarded and negatived by their pursuing the contrary course; 'non ita sibi chari fuerunt ut cogitarent de vitâ æternâ,' Cocceius.
 cause;' almost' 'so for this cause,' кal serving to mark the correspondence between the judgments and the course of conduct that had provoked them, and perhaps involving partly a consecutive and partly a contrasting force; comp. note on the uses of кai, on Phil. iv. $12 . \quad \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon t]$ 'doth send;' not so much an ethical (see ver. 9) as a direct present; the mystery of iniquity is even now at work (ver. 7), and is even now calling down on itself the punishment of judicial obduracy. There is no need for explaining away $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon t$ ( $\sigma \cup \gamma \chi \omega \rho \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \quad \phi a-$ $\nu \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi \lambda a^{\prime} \nu \eta \nu$, Theod., comp. Theod.Mops., Theoph., Ecum.), nor is it right merely to ascribe it to a form of thought in the age of the Apostle (Jowett), nor enough to say merely that ' whatever God permits He ordains,' Alf. The words are definite and significant; they point to that 'judicial infatuation' (Waterl. Serm. Vol. v. p. 486,-differently however in Vol. 1v. p. ${ }^{6}{ }^{6}$ ) into which, in the development of His just government of the world, God causes evil and error to be unfolded, and which He brings into punitive agency in the

 $\sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s[\hat{\varepsilon} \nu] \tau \hat{\eta}$ àdıкíq.
12. $[\hat{\epsilon} \nu] \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa i q]$ The reading is not quite certain ; $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{2} \nu$ is given by Rec. and Tisch. ed. 2, 7, with $\mathrm{AD}^{3} \mathrm{EKLN}^{4}$; most mss. ; Orig. (2), Chrys., Theod., but is enclosed in brackets by Lachm., and was rejected by Tisch. ed. 1, with $\mathrm{BD}^{1}$ FGN ${ }^{1} ; 7$ mss.; Orig. (z), Hippol., al. C is deficient. As, though the construction with the simple dat. is not found in the N. T., the omission of the preposition may have been suggested here by a desire to preserve a parallelism of clauses, we still retain the $\varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ in the text, but deem it necessary to mark the increased doubt which the authority of $\mathbb{N}$ produces by enclosing the word in brackets.
case of obstinate and truth-hating rejection of His offers and calls of mercy; comp. Müller, Doctr. of Sin, Book v. Vol. I. p. 47 I (Clark), and see two able Sermons on this text by South, Serm. Vol. 11. p. 192-228. The reading of Rec. $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi \in \epsilon\left[\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKLN}^{4}\right.$; mass. ; Clarom., Augiens., majority of Vv., and many Ff.] is rightly rejected by most modern editors, being inferior in uncial authority to $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \iota\left[\mathrm{ABD}^{1} \mathrm{~F}\right.$ GN ${ }^{1}$; 67 ; Vulg. (Amiat.), Orig. (3), al.], and a correction of it that would easily suggest itself.
èvepyelav $\pi \lambda$ ג́vŋs] 'an in-working of
 --here a most questionable solution of the governing subst. (see Winer, Gr. § 34. 3, p. 2II), but, in accordance with $\delta v \nu a \dot{\mu} \epsilon-\psi \in \dot{\delta} \delta o v s$, of which $\ell \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma$. $\pi \lambda \alpha^{2} \eta s$ is a kiud of summary,-'a working which tends to enhance and develop $\pi \lambda a \dot{\alpha} \eta$,' the gen. being (as $\psi$ evovous in verse 9) that of 'the point
 $\epsilon i s \tau \grave{\partial} \pi \lambda a \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$, Theoph. On the meaning of $\pi \lambda a ́ v \eta$ ('erroris,' Vulg.), see notes on I Thess, ii. 3, and Eph.
 'to the intent that they should believe the lie,' opposed to 'the truth ' (ver. ı), scil. the falsehood implied in the

(Green, Gram. p. 14r), not falsehood generally, as Middl. Gr. Art. p. 383 (ed. Rose) ; clause stating the purpose of God ('non meram sequelam,'Schott) in sending to them the $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \in \gamma \rho . \pi \lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \eta \eta s$ by His judicial act. He sends a power of a nature designed to work out the appointed issue, and to bring about a state which involves its own chastisement. On the force of $\epsilon l s \tau o$ in sentences similar to the present, see Meyer on Rom. i. 20.
12. ¿va крı立бtv äтavтєs]'that they may all of them be judged;' more remote purpose involved in the preceding words $\epsilon l s$ cò $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu} \sigma a \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., with which this clause seems more naturally connected than directly with the preceding $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon$. The preceding $\epsilon$ is $\tau \delta$ к.т.入. renders a reference to result. ('quo fiet ut,' Schott) here distinctly untenable. It need scarcely be said. that $\kappa \rho \ell \theta \omega \hat{\sigma} \boldsymbol{v}$ is not per se 'might be. damned,' Auth. ( ${ }^{\nu} \nu \alpha$ катакрө $\theta \hat{\omega} \sigma$, Chrys.), but simply 'may be judged,' 'judicentur,' Vulg., the further idea of an unfavourable judgment being supplied by the context; comp. крîua in I Tim. iii. 6 , and see notes in loc. The reading is doubtful : Tisch, reads ä $\pi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ with AFGN ; niss. ; Orig. (2), Cyr.: Rec. and Lachm. (non marg.) adopt $\pi$ áv $\tau \epsilon s$ with BDEL ; mss. ; Orig.

We must thank God that He hath chosen and called you. Hold what we delivered unto you; and may God stablish you.




(I), many Ff. The evidence is thus very evenly balanced.
 pleasure in unrighteousness.' On the meaning of eujoкềv ('re aut personâ delectari,' Fritz.), compare notes on I Thess. ii. 8, but see esp. the elaborate note of Fritz. Rom. x. i, Vol. iI. p. 369 sq .
13. 'Hucis $\delta 6]$ ' But we,' scil. the Apostle and his companions, Silvanus and Timothy (ch. i. i), not St Paul alone (Jowett),-placed by means of the oppositive $\delta \frac{1}{c}$ in contrast with those alluded to in the foregoing verses.
 tet,' Copt. [sempsha]; the verb odeineav, as in ch. i. 3, expressing the duty on its subjective side, 'das innerlich Gedrungenfühlen,' Lünem. On the connexion of ejxaplateì with nepl, and on the meaning of the verb, see notes and reff. on I Thess. i. 2.
di $\delta \in \lambda \phi o l$ к.т.. .] Similarly, i Thess. i.
 cept that Kupiou here, as nearly always in St Paul's Epp., refers to our Lord, not to God the Father. Though love, as Alf. remarks, is in this sort of collocation somewhat more usually referred by St Paul to the First Person of the blessed Trinity (ver. 16, Eph. ii. 4, al.), yet such references to the Second Person are by no means without precedent; comp. Rom. viii. 37, Eph. v. 2, 25. ठ̈ть єضато к.т. ${ }^{\text {. }]}$ 'that God chose you;' objective sentence (' quod,' Vulg., ?, Syr.), stating the matter and grounds, surely not ' the reason,' Alf. (comp. Ath., Auth.), of the eixapiotla; see I Thess. ii. I3, ${ }_{1}$ Cor. i. 14, and on objective sen-
tences generally, or as they are sometimes termed 'expositive' sentences, consult Schmalfeld, Synt. $\S 1 \sigma_{3}$ sq., Donalds. Gr. $\$ 58_{4} \mathrm{sq}$. The verb al$\rho \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a l$ is a är. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in St Paul's Epp. in reference to the divine $\epsilon_{\kappa} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \gamma \boldsymbol{\eta}$, the term $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a c$ being used in I Cor. i. 27, 28, and Eph. i. 4 ; comp. I Thess. i. 4, and Reuss, Théol. Chrét. iv. 14, Vol. II. p. 133 sq. Rec. reads є'ileto with K ; most mss., but the Alexandrian form eiliato (see Lobeck, Phryn. p. s83) is rightly adopted by Lachm., Tisch., and most modern editors, with greatly preponderating authority [ABDEFGLN; some mss.; Theod. (ms.)]. On these forms in the N.T., see Tisch. Prolegom. p. Lvi (ed. 7), and the somewhat opposing comments of Scrivener, Introd. to N.T. vili. 6, p. 416.
 'from the beginning,' scil. of all things, 'from eternity;' so I John i. I, ii. I3, but not elsewhere in St Paul's Epp., where the more distinctive formule $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ к а \tau а \beta о \lambda \hat{\eta} s ~ к б \sigma \mu о v(E p h . ~ i . ~ 4), ~ \pi \mu \grave{o}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad a i \omega \nu \nu \omega \nu(\mathrm{I}$ Cor. ii. 7), $\pi \rho \dot{\partial} \chi \rho \delta \nu \omega \nu$ alcol $\omega \nu$ (2 Tim. i. 9), and more re-
 9), are used to express the same or a similar idea. The reference to the beginning of the gospel-preaching (Michaelis, al.) is riglitly rejected by Schott and Lünem., as requiring some explanatory supplement either immediately connected with d $\rho \chi \grave{\eta}$ (Phil. iv. 15) or obviously involved in the context (I John ii. 7, 24). Finally the reading $\dot{a}_{\pi \alpha a \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu}$ (Lachm., Tisch. ed. I) has the good external support of BFG; 5 mss. ; Vulg., but is inferior in external authority to $\alpha^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \dot{a}^{\prime} \rho$ -


$\chi$ रीs [which is found in DEKLN ; nearly all mss. and Vv.; Gr. and Lat. Ff. A non liquet and C is deficient. ' $A \pi$ ap $\chi \grave{\eta} \nu$ tacitly involves such a contradiction to actual fact (the Thessalonians were not the first believers in Maced.), that we can here scarcely hesitate in our chcice.

Пvev́paros] 'in sanctification of the Spirit,' scil. wrought by, and effected by the Spirit; $\Pi \nu \epsilon \dot{y} \mu a r o s$ being the gen. of the causa efficiens (see notes on I Thess. i. 6), and referring not to man's spirit (Schott), but to the personal Holy Spirit. No argument can be founded on the omission of the article, as in the first place such omissions are not rare with $\Pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$, and secondly, it might here be due to the common principle of correlation ; comp. Middl. Gr. Art. III. 3. 7, p. 49 (ed. Rose). The prep. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ may be instrumental (Chrys., Liinem., al.), but is perhaps more naturally taken in its usual sense as denoting the spiritual state in which the cildaro els $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l a v$ was realized; see Winer, Gr. § 50.5 , p. 370 , who in ed. 5 with less accuracy referred it to $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho / a$. The assumption of De W. that $\varepsilon \nu$ is here equivalent to $\epsilon i s$ is well refuted by Lünem., who justly urges the obscuring effect this would have on the preceding $\epsilon$ is
 'faith in the truth;' à $\lambda \theta \theta$ eias not being a gen. of quality ( $\pi l \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ à $\lambda \eta \theta o \hat{s}$, Chrys.), but simply the gen. objecti, see Winer, Gr. § 30. 1, p. 167, and comp. Phil. i. 27.
14. eis d] 'whereunto,' scil. els $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l a \nu$ t̀ $\dot{a} \gamma เ a \sigma \mu \hat{\psi}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. , not 'ad electionem atque animum quo eâdern digni evadimus' (Pelt), as the historical èкdлeनev naturally stands in connexion, not with the election
which had taken place $\dot{\alpha} \pi^{\prime} \dot{a} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} \bar{\eta}$, but with those issues contemplated by the ellato which had their commencements in time. So rightly Theoph.,


 ó FGN ; Vulg., al. add кal.
$\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{s} s]$ The reading of Lachm. $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ has the support of ABD ${ }^{1}$; a few mss.; Clarom., Sangerm., Augiens., and,as $\dot{u} \mu \mathrm{a} s$ might have been a conformation to the preceding $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s,-$ is plausible, but hardly sufficiently supported by external authority to be admitted with confidence.
 our Gospel,' scil. 'the Gospel we preached,' that which involved the $\dot{a} \kappa \circ \dot{\eta} \nu$ which is the antecedent of $\pi l$ otis; comp. Rom. x. 17, and Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 2, p. 267 . On the exact genitival relation of $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, see notes on 1 Thess. i. 5 . $\quad$ is $\pi \in p$ тоl $\eta \sigma$ เv к.т.入.] 'unto the obtaining of the glory of our Lord J. C.,' 'in adquisitionem gloriæ,' Vulg., Copt., compare有th. 'ut vivatis in gloriâ Domini;' more exact specification of the preceding eis $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a \nu(v e r .13$ ), the term $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o l \eta \sigma \iota s$ giving the $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l a$ the aspect of a кrर्ŋु $\iota s$ (Hesych., Suid.), and that of a glory of which Christ was-not the author (Pelt), but, in accordance with the analogy of Scrip-ture-the Lord and possessor; see John xvii. ${ }^{24}$, comp. Rom. viii. 17. See esp. notes on I Thess. v. 9, where this meaning of $\pi \epsilon \rho / \pi$. is briefly investigated. Of the two other interpretations of $\pi \epsilon \rho / \pi .,-(a)$ active, with re-
 $\pi o c \hat{\eta} \sigma \eta \tau \hat{\varphi} v i \hat{\varphi}$ aủrov̂, (Ecum.; and (b) passive (comp. Eph. i. 14), $\delta o \xi \xi \bar{\xi}$ being resolved into an adj., scil. 'gloriosa



possessio，＇Est．2，－the first is gram－ matically，the second contextually doubtful．In the case of（a）we must have had the usual dative of＇interest，＇ not（as here）a gen．of possession；in the case of（b）the seeming parallelism with I Thess．v． 9 would be destroyed， and the glorification of our Lord would really become the object of the
$\kappa а \lambda \epsilon i v$, as Syr．expressly êoon？

ria Domino nostro］，not the future reserved for the Thessalonians，on which the illative exhortation of ver． 15 （ $\tilde{\mu} \rho a$ oviv）seems logically to depend；comp．Lünem．in loc．

15．äpa oilv к．т．$\lambda$ ］＇Accordingly then，brethren，stand（firm）；＇exhorta－ tion following on the preceding decla－ ration of the gracious purpose of God， －the illative $\alpha^{\prime} \rho a$ being supported by the collective ouv；see notes on Gal． vi．1o，and reff．on r Thess．v．6．On the present derivative meaning of $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \epsilon \tau \epsilon$（perstate，Beza，$\mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \lambda \dot{\eta}$－ $\theta \eta \tau \epsilon$ ，Ecum．；comp．I Thess．iii．8）， here suitably used in retrospective an－ tithesis to $\sigma a \lambda \epsilon \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a_{l}$（ver．2），see notes on I Thess．iii． 8 and Phil．i． 27.
кратєі̂тє т⿺̀s тapaסórets］＇hold fast the instructions；＇practically synony－ mous with I Cor．xi．2，Tàs mapa $\delta \delta \sigma$ ets $\kappa а \tau \epsilon \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ．These $\pi а \rho а \delta \delta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s$（Mark vii． 3，Gal．i．I4，al．）probably related，－ not as in I Cor．l．c．（see Meyer in loc．）to matters both of doctrine and discipline，but，as the more specific $\epsilon \delta \delta \delta \alpha \chi \theta \eta r \epsilon$ and the general tenor of the context（comp．ver．5）suggest， solely to the former，канбиa סьбабка－
$\lambda_{i a s}$ ，Theod．The polemical and con－ troversial use of the term，hinted at even by Chrys．，is brought forward by Damasc．（de Imag．1．23，Vol．1．p． 518，Paris， 1712 ），and enforced by most writers of the Romanist Cburch （comp．Canon．Cone．Trid．Sess．vv． p．15，ed．Tauchn．），but distinctly without plausibility．No reference to any $\hat{\epsilon}^{\kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa д \nu ~ ф \rho б \nu \eta \mu a ~(E u s e b . ~}$ Hist．Eccl．จ．28；comp．Möhler， Symbolik，§ 38，p．361）can fairly be elicited from the words．The Apostle，as the following clause most distinctly shows，is referring to some definite and lately－given communi－ cations on doctrine which he had specially made to the Thessalonians （comp．ェ Cor．l．c．，ка $\theta \dot{\omega} s ~ \pi a p t \delta \omega \kappa a$ ） by word of mouth and in his former letter．For the most ingenious modern defence of the Romanist doctrine of tradition，see Möhler，Symbolik，l．c． p． $3^{61}-365$ ． ds E8L $\delta$ áx ${ }^{\theta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ ］＇which ye were taught．＇ For exx．of this well－known con－ struction，see Winer，Gr．§ 32．5，p． 204，and for the general theory of the connexion of the accus．with passive verbs，Schmalfeld，Syntax，§ 25，p． 29 sq． єlite $\delta$ Là $\lambda$ dóyou к．т．ג．］＇whether by word or by our epistle，＇一 $\epsilon \pi เ \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$（gen．auc－
 ver．2．We can hardly say with Gom．（cited and approved by Pelt， comp．Schott）—＇el＇re non disjungit，sed conjungit et copulat；＇it rather sub－ divides the general $\ell \delta \delta \delta d \chi \theta \eta r \epsilon$ into the two special modes in which $\delta \delta \delta a \chi \eta$ is usually and regularly conveyed；comp． 1 Cor．xiii．8，and Meyer in loc．



 mss.; Augiens., Syr.; al. Lachm. (in marg.) and Tisch. follow Rec. in reading каi $\pi$. with $\mathrm{AD}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$; mss.; Vulg., Clarom., al. Although judgment cannot be absolutely pronounced, yet the reading given in the text has certainly the best claim to appear there. The previous variations in the reading of the clause are noticed below.
our Lord himself;' concluding prayer after exhortation, as in ch. iii. 16

 $\delta \epsilon$ contrasting the succeeding prayer with the foregoing exhortation, and the aưros giving force and dignity to the mention of our Lord as compared with the preceding $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$; comp. the similar concluding prayers in I Thess. iii. II, v. 23, in both which cases however the connexion is less close, and the contrasting force, both of the particle and the pronoun, somewhat less emphatic. Our Lord is put first in the enumeration (2 Cor. xiii. 13), contrary to the Apostle's usual habit of writing, either on account of the recent mention of Him in ver. 14, or from the feeling that it was by His grace alone tbat they could bave strength to carry into practice the preceding exhortations; 'per gratiam Christi venitur ad Patris amorem,' Bengel on 2 Cor. l.c. This unusual order is not left unnoticed by Chrys. and the Greek expositors; $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\eta} s$
 Theod. The readings throughout the clause are somewhat doubtful. Besides the variation given in the critical note, Lachm. differs from Tisch. in inserting $\dot{o}$ before $\mathrm{X} \rho \stackrel{\sigma}{ } \boldsymbol{\sigma} \delta{ }^{\prime}$ [with A], and including it in brackets before $\theta \epsilon \delta s\left[\mathrm{BD}^{1}\right.$ omit $]$. $\quad$ © $\epsilon \dot{\delta} s$
 exact form of expression, though so strongly supported here, does not ap-
pear to occur elsewhere.
 only to God the Father. The union of Father and Son, esp. as shown by the subsequent singular verb, is I confess so mystically close that it is difficult to speak with complete confidence (Alf., but see his previous note), still the usual reference of $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{d} \pi \eta$ to the Father (see above) may incline us here to the more exclusive reference. The arbitrary reference of the first of the two participles to Christ, and of the second to God the Father (Baumg.-Crus.), is almost obviously untenable. $\quad$ тара́к $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ otv aiculav] 'eternal comfort;' the best shade of meaning for $\pi а \rho a ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma t s$ here. Alcuycos is used not appy. with any specially qualitative reference to an $\epsilon \lambda \pi i \delta a \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (Chrys., Theoph.), but mainly in a temporal sense, in contrast to the transitory and fleeting nature of earthly joys (Olsh.): the $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu e \lambda \lambda \delta v \tau \omega \nu$ is embodied in the $\epsilon \lambda \pi i \delta a$ d́ $\gamma a \theta \dot{\eta} \eta$, 'la perspective d'un heureux avenir,' Reuss, Theol. Chrét. iv. 9, Vol. iI. p. 85 ; comp., though with a slightly different refer. ence, $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu a к а р i a \nu \quad \epsilon \lambda \pi i \delta a$, Tit. ii. 13. Alcurtos is used in the N. T. as an adj. of two terminations except here and Heb. ix. 12.
èv Xápırı] 'in grace;' adjunct of manner, not to both preceding participles (aja . being more usually undefined, Rom. viii. 37, Gal. ii. 20, al.), but to סoús (Schott, and appy. Chrys.,
 $\kappa \alpha i \lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\omega}$ ．

Finally，pray for the advance of the Lord＇s word，and for us． He will stablish you；and may He guide your

Tò $\lambda o \iota \pi \grave{o} \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \partial ́ \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, ar $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i$, III．



Exam．），the $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ as usual defining the sphere and element in which the love is evinced and the consolation vouchsafed．In cases like the present the line of demarcation between the above reference to ethical locality and the instrumental use（ $\chi$ di $\rho \iota \tau \iota$ ，Chris．） is really very shadowy．It can scarcely be doubted that such a use has arisen from the inclusive nature of the Aramaic $\Omega$ ，and it is well not to be unduly narrow in interpreta－ tion；still in most of the expressions similar to the present there is a the－ logical idea，－an idea of an encompass－ ing element of grace，which it seems desirable to retain；comp．notes on I Thess．ii． 3 ．
17．тарака入 $\epsilon \sigma$ а．］＇comfort；＇opt． and sing．，as in I Thess．iii．ir， where see notes．The Apostle does not say merely $\dot{\mu} \mu \hat{a} s$ ，but $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau d s$ карঠias（comp．Col．ii．2）；it was the карঠia，the seat of their feelings and affections（comp．notes on I Tim．i．5， Beck，Seelenl．111．24，p． 92 sq．），the кapdia that was so full of hope and fear about the future，that the Apo－ stile prayed might receive comfort．
 Syr．，comp．Fth．），seems thus in the present case more suitable than＇ex－ hortetur，＇Vulg．，as a translation of таракал $\epsilon \sigma a l$ ；see notes on i Thess． v．II．ornplfal］＇stablish
 $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon$ парак入ivєбөat，Chrys．；comp． I Thess．iii．2．The obvious supple－ mont $\dot{j} \mu \hat{a} s$ is inserted by Rec．with
$\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$ ；mss．，but rightly rejected by Lachm．and Tisch．with very de－ cidedly preponderating uncial autho－
 ＇in every good work and word；＇both тар $\tau \ell$ and ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma a \theta \hat{\varphi}$ being clearly con－ netted with the two intervening sub－ stantives．The slightly unusual order
 only with FGK；mss．］has appy． caused the Greek commentators（silt Theod．）to assign the doubtful meaning $\delta \delta \gamma \mu a \tau a$ to the simple word $\lambda 6 \gamma \varphi$ ． This is by no means probable；the association with ${ }^{\text {t }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \varphi$（comp．Fritz． Rom．xv．18，Vol．III．p．268），and still more the inclusive ravel，seem both decisive for the ordinary mean－ ing．It is singular that Chris．（so Theoph．）should have here taken iv as instrumental；clearly the ${ }^{2} \rho \gamma \gamma_{0}$ kail no $o$ os are not the means by which，but the elements in which the $\sigma \tau \eta \rho c \gamma \mu$ os takes place．
 nally，＇＇as to what remains to be said；＇similar in meaning to $\lambda_{0} \iota \pi \dot{b} y$ （I Thess．iv．I），but owing to the article slightly more specific．On the grammatical difference between this formula and the gen．$\tau 0 \hat{u} \lambda o i \pi o \hat{v}$ ，see notes on Gal．vi． 17.


 On the formula $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \dot{x}$ о $\mu a r \pi \varepsilon \rho l$ ，and its practical equivalence to $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ ix－ $\mu a c$ ن $\pi \notin \rho$ ，see notes on Col．i． 3 ．
tva．$\delta$ 入óyos к．т． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．］Subject of the

## 

prayer blended with the purpose of making it, as so often in St Paul's Epp.; see notes on Eph. i. 17. This prayer of the Apostle, as Chrys. has well observed, was not tya $\mu \dot{\eta}$ к $\kappa \nu \delta \nu \nu \epsilon u ́ n$ ( $\epsilon$ ls тoûto ràp téciro), but that his Lord's word (compare i Thess. i. 8) might speed onward and be glorified. As ever so now his prayer did not involve one single selfish element.
 course and be glorified;' 'currat et clarificetur,' Vulg., i.e. may find no cbstacles and hindrances ( $\alpha \kappa \omega \lambda u ́ \tau \omega s$ $\sigma v \nu \tau \rho \in \chi \eta$, Theod., $\pi \rho о к о ́ \pi \tau \eta$, Damase.) in its onwarà course (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 2, oú $\delta \hat{\delta} \delta \epsilon \tau a l)$, and be manifested, felt, and acknowledged in its true power and glory by all ; compare ch.i. 12 , but not, as usually cited, Acts xiii. 48, -where, as De W. rightly observes, the word ( $\delta o \xi \xi_{j} \zeta$.) has a somewhat weaker force, more nearly approaching to 'laudare,' comp. Schneider on Xen. Anab. v. 9. 32. The middle force adopted by Pelt, 'laudem sibi paret,' is not supported by the usage of the N.T., nor isit at all accurate to say that $\dot{a} \pi \delta$ would have been more naturally used if the verb had been passive. If any other prep. had been used, it would have been $\dot{u} \pi \dot{\delta}$ (Matth. vi. 2, Luke iv. I5) or $\epsilon \nu$ (John xvii.ro,al.) with persons: comp. $\delta 0 \xi a \sigma$ $\theta \hat{\eta} \ldots . . \delta \iota^{\prime} a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\eta} s[\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon v \in l a s]$ in John xi. 4. Mpos however is perfectly suitable, as denoting the locality reached where the glorification took place. On the use of $\pi \rho \delta{ }^{5}$ with verbs implying rest, \&c., see notes on Gal. i. 18 .
ka日ぁs kal mpòs îpâs] 'even as it is also with you;' the кai gently contrasting them with others where a similar reception had taken place, and the clause ' tacitâ laude' (Est.) reminding them of their previous and present
readiness to receive the Word; comp. I Thess. i. 6 sq.
2. кal $\ell \nu \alpha \dot{\rho} v \sigma \theta \omega ิ \mu \in \nu]$ 'and that we may be delivered,' that we may by our freedom co-operate in this advance of God's word. To find here a mere shrinking of the flesh on the part of the Apostle from the dangers that awaited him (Jowett) is to assign to the Apostle a character that never belonged to him, and which such passages as Rom. xv. $3^{1}$ (see ver. 32, which shows the true reason) and 2 Cor. i. 8 most certainly do not substantiate. How much keener are the perceptions of the older commentators;

 $\dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu, \dot{\alpha} \kappa \omega \lambda \dot{\tau} \tau \omega s$ каi ò $\tau 0 \hat{0} \kappa \eta \rho \dot{\gamma} \gamma-$

т $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ а่ $\boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{v}$ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \boldsymbol{\lambda}$.$] 'perverse and$ wicked men,' or, in the more derivative sense of the term ${ }^{\prime}$ тonos, - 'iniquis et malis hominibus,' Clarom.;
 rum et perversorum], where the order is appy. reversed. The word ärotos, frequently used by Plato, and in connexion with kalvós (Rep. III. p. 405D), Өavuartos (Legg. I. p. 646 B), and a $\dot{\eta} \theta \eta \mathrm{\eta}$ (Tim. p. 48 D, Legg. vil. p.
 тómò (Suid. s.v.), and thence derivatively, as the same lexicographer observes, кakós, $\mu 0 \chi \theta \eta \rho \delta$ s (see Bekk. Anecd. p. 460, Hesych. тов $\quad$ ро́s, al $\sigma \chi \rho o s)$, with concomitant ideas of 'mischief,' $d c$., according to the context; see Luke xxiii. 4I, Acts $x x v$. 5, xxviii. 6, Philo, Leg. Alleg. ini.

 p. 98, ed. Mang.), and the exx. collected by Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 145 sq.

Who these men were


is somewhat doubtful. The most natural supposition is that they were perverse and fanatical Jews (not Christians, on account of what follows) at Corinth, who were then opposing the word of God and the Apostle's ministry of it ; comp. Acts xviii. 12 sq. and Wieseler, Chronol. p. 256. The remark of Tertullian seems to have always been very true in reference to the early Church,-'synagogas Judæorum fontes persecutionum,' adv. Gnost. Scorp. cap. 10.
 faith doth not pertain to all men;' reason for the foregoing clause and the mention of those alluded to in it. The definite $\dot{\eta}$ riotcs can here only refer to ' 'aith' in the Christian sense ( $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a$, Ecum., and perhaps Syr.
 Schott, 'fides sincera et constans,' in contrast to false Christians ( $\psi \in \cup \delta a \dot{d} \epsilon \lambda$ $\phi o t$, Gal. ii. 4), seems inconsistent with the use of the simple unqualified substantive. For exx. of this not uncommon use of the possessive gen., see Krüger, Sprachl. §47. 6. 8, and comp. Acts i. 7, Winer, Gr. § 30.5 , p. 176. Wetstein in loc. quotes the well-known proverbial saying oú $\pi$ a $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{-}$
 cited by Suidas s. vv. oú maytbs, Vol. II. p. 1220 (ed. Bern.).
3. mtords $\delta$ к к.т.入.] 'But faithful is the Lord;' antithesis to the member immediately preceding, with a paronomasia, or rather play on the word, suggested by the preceding riotus; comp. 2 Tim. ii. $\mathrm{I}_{3}$, and see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 68. 2, p. $5^{6 \mathrm{I}}$, where the distinction is drawn between simple paronomasia and a play on words (Wortspiel) where a fresh or slightly
changed meaning is introduced. There seems no reason for departing, either here or in ver. 4 , from the usual reference of $\dot{o}$ Kupos to the second person of the blessed Trinity; comp. notes on ch. ii. r3. The reading adopted by Lachm, $\dot{\delta}$ 日eós [AD ${ }^{1} \mathrm{FG}$; Vulg. (not Amiat.), Armen. (marg.) ; Latin Ff.], seems to be a correction, and conformation to the more usual formula, 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13,2 Cor. i. 18.
 you,' not perhaps without a faint explanatory force in the relative, 'being one who will, dec.;' comp. notes on I Tim. ii. 4, and on Col. i. 25, 27. The form arnploet (found in B) is noticed by Winer, Gr. § 55, p. 82, and is not without analogy in Alexandrian Greek. dimd toû movnpoû] 'from the Wicked One.' Here as elsewhere in the N.T. it is extremely doubtful whether roû nov $\eta$. $\rho o \hat{v}$ refers to evil in the abstract (see Rom. xii. 9), or to the Evil One ( 1 John v. 18, comp. Eph. vi. 16, and notes in loc.). The context alone must decide; and this in the present case, in spite of the reference to ch. ii. 17 ,
 by Lünem. and repeated by Alf., seems rather in favour of the mascu-line,-(r) in consequence of the probable ref. to the Lord's prayer, where the Greek commentators(whose opinion in such points deserves full consideration) adopt the masc.,-and (2) from the tacit personal antithesis suggested by the preceding Kúplos. The ancient Vr., whose testimony would here have been of considerable importance, do not seem to afford us any sure indications of the view they adopted. The same word, we may observe, is used by Syr. both here and in I John v. I8,

##  

where the meaning is not doubtful.
 we have trust in the Lord;' declaration of the Apostle's trust in his con-verts,--the $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$ subjoining with a faint antithesis to the simple future just preceding ('ei quæ jam significata est similis notio quodam modo opponitur,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 361) the Apostle's present trust and convictions, and paving the way for the exhortations in ver. 6 sq. ; кal тồvo cis

 $\beta \epsilon \beta a \iota \omega \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \tau \alpha u ́ r a s$, Theod. This $\pi \epsilon \pi \frac{}{}$ O $\quad$ ots was now as ever $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \mathrm{Kup} \dot{\prime} \varphi$; it was not only a trust in His $\phi<\lambda a v \theta \rho \omega-$ mia (Chrys.), but a trust in Him as the blessed sphere and element in which alone it could be truly felt and entertained: see Phil. ii. 19, and notes on Eph. iv. 17, vi. г.
' $\phi^{\prime}$ ' $\left.\mathbf{v} \mu \hat{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{s}\right]$ ' in regard of you ;' the preposition marking the ethical direction of the $\pi \epsilon \pi o t \theta \varepsilon \nu a l$; comp. Matth. xxvii. 43, 2 Cor. ii. 3, and see Winer, Gr. $\S 49.1$, p. 363 . It is very difficult to draw clear lines of demarcation between the ethical uses of $\pi$ pós, $\bar{\epsilon} \pi l$, and $\epsilon$ s, in combinations like the present. To speak somewhat generally, we may perhaps say that $\pi \rho o{ }^{\text {s }}$ with the acc. commonly indicates simple ethical motion (comp. Donalds. Crat. § $169,17 \mathrm{I}$ ) ; $\quad \dot{\pi} i$ with the same case mental direction with an idea of approximation (Donalds. ('rat. § $\mathrm{f}^{2}$ ) and a more defined expression of the erga (Luke vi. 35) or contra (Matth. x. 21); eis direction or destination with the idea of having actually reached the object (comp. Krüger, Sprachl. §68. 21. 5, and notes on Philem. 5), and with a wider and more inclusive notion of general behaviour however
characterized. For the distinctions between cis, $\pi \rho o ́ s$, and кatá, see notes on Tit. i. I.
öть à mapayץ(n入.] 'that the things which we command:' objective or expositive sentence (Donalds. Gr. $\$ 584$, see notes on ch. ii. 13), stating the matter of the Apostle's confidence. The â $\pi$ apar ${ }^{\text {é }} \lambda \lambda$., -clearly not 'quæ preceepimus,' Pelt,-here refers most naturally to the commands which the Apostle is now in the act of giving to his converts, and links the present verse in an easy and natural way to ver. 6.
кal moleite к. motíб. belongs to the apodosis of the sentence, кai...кal presenting both $\pi 0<\epsilon \hat{\tau} \tau$ and $\pi o t \eta \sigma$. simultaneously in a single predication; see notes on I Tim.iv. Io. There is in this verse much variation of reading. After $\pi a \rho a \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda о \mu \epsilon \nu$ Rec. inserts $\dot{v} \mu i \nu$, but it is rightly omitted by Lachm, and Tisch. with BD ${ }^{1 N}$; 2 mss . ; Vulg., al. The insertion may have been suggested by ver. 6. Also Lachm. reads
 тоєєît каі $\pi \sigma \iota \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, but the reading in this extended form is supported only by B, as FG (which insert кal $\epsilon \pi o \iota \eta \eta_{\sigma}$.)
 however whether the kai should be retained before $\pi$ otê̂te as it is omitted by $\mathrm{AD}^{1} \mathbf{N}^{1}$; Syr. Observe that C is deficient.
5. ó $\delta \mathbf{E} \mathrm{K} \dot{\mathrm{p}}$. к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.] 'But may the Lord direct your hearts;' repetition of the A postle's prayor, introduced in the form of a gentle antithesis ( $\delta \epsilon$ ) to what precedes,-'I doubt you not, my confidence is in the Lord; may He however vouchsafe His blessed aid; $\dot{a} \mu \phi о \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{i} \nu \quad \chi \rho \epsilon l a$ каі $\pi \rho о \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ à $\gamma a \theta \hat{\eta} s$ кal $\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad a ̈ \nu \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon i a s$, Theod. The appearance of $\tau$ ov̂ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$
 $\dot{v} \pi о \mu o \nu \dot{\eta} \nu$ toû X рıбтồ.

Avoid all disorderly brethren, and imitate us. We charge such to labour, and bid yon mark them that disobey. The Lord give you peace.

Пара $\gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda о \mu \epsilon \nu \quad \delta_{\epsilon} \dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu, a \dot{a} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i, 6$


in the concluding member of the verse has led Basil (de Spir. Sanct. cap. 21), Theod., Theoph., Ecc., and recently Wordsw., to refer ó Kúpoos to the Holy Spirit. This however is unnecessary, and indeed contrary to the language of the N.T.; Kúpos appy. not being so applied even in the debateable passage 2 Cor. iii. r8, see Meyer in loc. On the compound
 notes on I Thess. iii. in, and on the meaning of карбia in such combinations (here the centre of the active will and its practical applications), see Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. 1v. 12, p. 202, Beck, Seelenl. 11I. 24, p. 94, 95 .
cls rìv dy. тoù Єeov̂] finto the love of God;' principle to which and into which the Apostle prays that his converts may be guided. The only doubt is whether $\tau o \hat{v} \theta$ 位 is a gen. subjecti, under the more specific form of a gen. auctoris, scil. 'amor quem Deus hominum quasi infundit animis,' Pelt,-or rimply a gen. objecti, 'amorerga Deum,'
 The latter is most natural ; the love of God is indeed the 'virtutis Christianæ fons limpidissimus,' Schott; see Matth, xxii. 37.
 Christ.' The meaning of these words is also slightly doubtful, owing to the different aspects in which the gen. may be regarded. Analogy with what precedes would suggest (a) a gen. objecti, 'patient waiting for Christ' (Auth., Chrys. 2, Theoph. 2), but would introduce a meaning of $\dot{u} \pi \rho \mu$.
that is appy. not lexically defensible, and certainly is contrary to the usage of the N.T. Of the other meanings, (b) the gen. auctoris or cause efficientis (Pelt) is plausible, but appy. less simple than the more inclusive possessive gen. (Lünem., Alf.), 'patience such as

 comp. i Pet. ii. 21. On the meaning of the word $\dot{\text { in }} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rho \circ \nu \dot{\eta}$, see notes on I Thess. i. 3. The addition of the art. before $\dot{u} \pi o \mu o r \eta \eta^{\nu}$ which Rec, omits has the support of all the MSS. most mss, and Greek Ff.
 mand you;' transition by means of the
 to the more distinctly preceptive portion of the Epistle. In what follows, the exhortations of the former Epistle (ch.iv. II, I2, v. 14) are repeated and expanded with more studied distinctness of language, it being probable that the evils previously alluded to had advanced among some members of this Church to a still more perilous height. The words $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\partial} \nu \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~$ give the $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda l a$ a greater force and solemnity; oủX $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} s ~ \tau a \hat{v} \tau a ~ \lambda e ́ r o-~$ $\mu_{\xi \nu} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{o}$ X $\rho \iota \sigma$ ós, Chrys.: see I Cor. v. 4 , and comp. Acts iii. 6, xvi. 18 . The addition $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ after Kuplov (Rec., with $\mathrm{AD}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2}$ FGKLN ; mss. ; Vulg.), though strongly supported, is appy. lightly rejected by Tisch. with $\mathrm{BD}^{1}{ }^{1}$; Clarom., Sangerm. ; Cypr. (1), as a likely interpolation. Lachm. inserts it in brackets.
 ipass] 'that ye withdraw yourselves;


object-inf., stating the substance of the $\pi a \rho a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a$. The verb $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ [derived from a root ETA-, Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 19\%] properly signifies 'collecare,'-thence, with a not improbable figurative reference ( $\tau$ d iбtia, Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. Vol. II. p. r529), 'cohibere,' 'comprimere,' and reflexively, 'se subtraliere,' Vulg., Clarom, [ut sitis distantes] Syr., 'gaskaidaip izvis,' Goth., sim. Copt., al.; comp.

 תָּ seems to suggest a tinge of the still further derivative meaning 'præ metu se subducere;' Hesych. фо $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\boldsymbol{i} \tau}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$, $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota]$, Gen. viii. I (Aquil.), and with an accus. 2 Cor. viii. $20, \dot{\sigma}_{\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ \mu \epsilon-~}^{\text {}}$ עoi roûro, rightly translated by Vulg. 'devitantes hoc ;' add also Gal. ii. I2,
 $\sigma \tau \epsilon l \lambda \eta \tau a \iota$. For further exx., see Elsver, Obs. Vol. пr. p. 283, Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 344, Loesner, Obs. p. 387 , where this verb is copiously illustrated.
ciтáктшs тєрьт.] 'walking disorderly;' comp. I Thess. v. I4, toùs á $\tau$ áктоиs, and see note on ver. 7. On this use of the verb $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi . \pi o v \tau \epsilon \sigma \pi \iota$ Blouvtos, Chrys.), as indicating the general course of a life in its habitual and practical manifestations, see reff. on I Thess. iv. I2, and comp. notes on Phil. iii. 18.

катd тìv mapá-
Bootv] 'according to the instruction or
 including both the oral (comp. ver, 10 , I Thess. iv. It) and written instructions which the Apostle had delivered to his converts. To refer this to a $\pi a \rho a ́ \delta o \sigma \iota \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \iota \alpha \alpha^{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\boldsymbol{z}} \rho \gamma \omega \nu$, as Chrys. and the Greek expositors do, is to infringe on what follows, where this
mode of teaching is distinctly speci-
 'which they received,' scil. those intimated in the foregoing expression $\pi a \nu \tau \dot{s} \dot{a} \delta \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \hat{v}$, which here serves the purpose of a collective substantive. The main difficulty is the reading. Lachm. (text) adopts $\pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda a \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ with BFG; 3 mss.; Goth., Syr.-Phil., al.,-but scarcely with plausibility, as the change would have been so easily suggested by the seeming difficulty of construction in the 3 rd plural. The same may be said of Rec. $\pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda a \beta \epsilon$, which however has only the authority of a few mss. and Syr. The choice then lies between $\pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda a \beta o \nu$ [Scholz, with $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKLN}{ }^{\star}$; mss.; Greek Ff.] and
 Lachm. in marg., with AN ${ }^{1}$; Basil,
 Versions support the third person plural: $C$ is deficient. The tendency to grammatical correction coupled with the known existence (Sturz, de Dial. Alex. p. 60, Matth. Gr. §201. 5) and prevalence even to a late period (Lo. beck, Phryn. p. 349) of the form -ooav in the $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. of the imperf. and second aor., induces us to acquiesce in the probable, though not strongly supported reading $\pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda \alpha \beta_{c} \sigma a \nu$; so Olsh., Lünem., Alf., and Wordsworth.
7. av̉тol үàp olf.] 'For yourselves know;' confirmation of the wisdom and pertinence of the foregoing exhortation, and more esp. of the modal clause immediately preceding, by an appeal to their own knowledge and observation. The Thessalonian converts knew 'of themselves' $\pi \hat{c} s \delta_{\epsilon} \hat{i}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. , and needed not that the Apostle should inform them.
 to imitate us;' a simple and intelligible



'brachylogy.' The more natural sequence would have been $\pi \hat{\omega} s \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \pi \epsilon \rho \imath-$ $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \hat{i}$ каl $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s \mu \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a l$, but the more brief mode of expression is probably designedly chosen, as throwing emphasis on the $\mu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta$ al, and giving the whole appeal more point and force. It is somewhat doubtful whether the plural is to be referred to St Paul alone, or to the Apostle and his associates. From comparison with I Thess. ii. 9 , where the ref. seems to be the more inclusive one, we shall most probably be justified in adopting the same view in the present case.
öth ov̉k ท่тaктío.] 'in that we behaved not disorderly.' This is appy. one of those cases in which the causal sentence approaches somewhat nearly, not so much to the modal (comp. Ath., kama [sicut, quemadmodum], Peile, 'how') as to the relative (comp. Syr. $\underset{n}{\infty} \overbrace{0}^{\circ} \prod_{0}^{0}$, [qui non ambulavimus]) or to the expositive sentence, with both of which it has some logical and grammatical affinity; comp. Winer, Gr. $\S 60$. 6, p. 479. It was not'so much 'because' St Paul and his associates oúk $\eta_{\tau} \alpha_{\kappa} \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, as 'seeing that,' 'in that,' such was the case, that the Thessalonians came to know how ('quali ratione vivendi,' Beng.) to imitate them. In a word, the $\epsilon \dot{T} \alpha \xi l a$ was not so much a cause, as a causa sine qua non of the knowledge. This use of $\delta \tau i$, which might perhaps be termed its 'sub-causal' or 'secondary causal' use, deserves some attention, esp. in the N. T.

The verb átaкjeiv is a $a^{\prime \prime \pi}$. $\lambda e \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., as is átaктos (I Thess. v. 14), while the adv. only occurs in ver. $6,1 t$, the
whole group being thus peculiar to these Epp. The word is here practically synonymous with $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ $\dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \omega s$, ver. II : it occurs occasionally in classical Greek, sometimes in a more restricted reference to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \rho \alpha-$ $\tau \iota \omega \tau \iota k d^{\prime}$ e.g. Demosth. Olynth. III. p. 3I, тoùs átaктô̂vtas ('qui disciplinam militarem labefactant,' Wolf), sometimes, as here, with a more general reference, e.g. Xen. Cyrop. VIII. I. 22; see Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 345.
8. оú6t Swpєàv ăptov èфd́y.] 'nor ate we bread for naught.' $\Delta \omega \rho \epsilon \grave{\alpha} \nu$ is an adverbial accusative implying either 'sine just今̂ causâ,' Gal. ii. 21 (see notes), or, as here, 'gratis,' Vulg., ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{B}^{\circ}$ Syr.,-the true idea of $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta a^{\prime}$ $\nu \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \omega \rho \in \AA \nu$ being 'ita accipere ut nihil referas, nulla prægressê causÂ accipiendi,' Tittm. Synon. II. p. 161. The formula dorov фarê̂y appears to be Hebraistic (comp. לְּ xliii. 25, 2 Sam. ix. 7, io, al.), implying really little more than the simple verb фarধî̀ (I Cor. ix. 4), but, like all these Hebraistic turns, being full of force and expressiveness; comp. Winer, Gr. § 3, p. 26 sq.
 vail,' scil. áaprov éф́́roнё̀ ; adjunct of manner, involving a tacit opposition to the preceding $\delta \omega \rho c a ́ y$. On the meaning and derivation of these words, and the apparent distinction between them, see notes on I Thess. ii. 9 .
vúкта каi $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu$. к.т.入.] ' working during night and day;' participial explanation of the preceding $\ell^{\ell} \nu$ ко́ $\pi \varphi$ каl $\mu \hat{o} \chi \theta \varphi$, more remotely dependent on the fore. going $\epsilon \phi \alpha \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$; see Winer, $G r . \S 45$. 6. b, p. 314. Lünem. connects the



participial clause closely with $\epsilon \nu \kappa \delta \pi \psi$ каl $\mu \delta \chi \theta \varphi$, according to which दो $\rho \gamma$. would have a more distinctly modal force. This is perfectly admissible; the emphatic position of $\delta \omega \rho \epsilon{ }^{2} \nu$ however suggests the sharper antithesis which the separation of the members here seems to introduce. The reading $\nu v \kappa \tau d s$ кaì $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a s$ [Lachm. (non marg.) with BFGN; 5 mss.; Chrys. (ms.), Dam.] has very strong claims to attention. Still it may have been suggested by I Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10. On the phrase itself, see notes on I Thess. l.c., and on I Tim. v. 5 .
 of not being burdensome to any of you;' object contemplated in the vúкта каl $\dot{\eta} \mu$. $\epsilon \rho \gamma a \zeta$. On the word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta a \rho$., see notes on I Thess. ii. 9 , where precisely the same words are used in reference to the same subject.
9. ou'X ${ }^{8} \tau \mathrm{~L}$ ] ' not that;' limitation of what precedes, to prevent the preceding declaration being misapprehended and misapplied: the Apostle reserves his ministerial right and privilege of receiving if need be support from his converts ; comp. I Cor. ix. 4 sq. On the use of this formula ('ex dialecticis, ut ita dicam, formulis Paulo solemnibus,' Pelt), which is found several times in St Paul's Epp. (2 Cor. i. 24, iii. 5, Phil. iii. 12, iv. [I, $\mathrm{I}_{7}$ ), see Hartung, Partik. Vol. II. p. I54, comp. Herm. Viger, No. 253.
'ॄ̧ovoiav] 'power,' 'right,' scil. rồ $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma$. (De W.), or more naturally
 the latter being the principal statement of the preceding verse. The word Ȩovala ('jus, licentia, auctoritas, aliquid faciendi,' Schott) is used exactly
similarly in I Cor. ix. I2.
Éautovs] 'ourselves;' with reference to the Apostle and his associates. On this use of $\dot{\varepsilon} a u \tau o u ̀ s$ for $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ a u ̉ r o u ́ s, ~$ $\dot{v} \mu \hat{s} s$ aùroús, see Winer, Gr. § 22.5, p. 136 , and for exx. in classical Greek, Krüger, Sprachl.§ 51. 2. 5 .
 the intent that ye, imitate us;' not merely an objective member, but as usual specifying the object and pur-
 Winer, Gr. § 44. 6, p. 295.
10. kal yáp] 'For also,' 'for besides;' second confirmation of the wisdom and pertinence of the preceding warning that they ought to avoid those that were walking disorderly,the $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$ being co-ordinate with the preceding $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ in ver. 7 , and the $\kappa \alpha l$ having appy. a conjunctive force, and serving to connect this argumentative clause with that in ver. 7 , and thus more thoroughly to substantiate the катà $\tau \grave{y} \nu \pi a \rho a ́ \delta . ~ \eta i \nu ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ L u ̈ n e m a n n, ~$ followed by Alf., makes кai ascensive, and refers it to тô̂тo $\pi a \rho \eta \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda$., as bringing out an additional element in the reminiscence. This is somewhat forced: $\kappa \alpha i$ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ has two usages in the N.T.,-one in which the conjunctive force of $\kappa a i$ prevails ('etenim,' Beza), the other ('nam etiam ;' ' nam et,' Vulg.,-but not Clarom., which omits 'et') in which the ascensive force is predominant ; see Winer, Gr. §53. 8, p. 397, and notes on Phil. ii. 27. The latter has been undoubtedly far too often overlooked in the N. T. (comp. Fritz. Rom. xi. I, Vol. II. p. 433), but is not to be obtruded in a passage like the present, where the context (contrast I Thess. iii. 4) and sequence



of argument seem somewhat decidedly in favour of the conjunctive use.
On the use of $\pi \rho \delta s$ with rival and verbs implying rest ( $\pi a \rho^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{i} \nu, \mu \in \theta^{\prime}$ $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, Theoph.), comp. notes on Gal. i. 18, and see I Thess. iii. 4, and ch. ii. 4 ( $e$ (s).
Toûto] 'this ,-that follows;' the pronoun being placed emphatically forward to direct attention to the sueseeding declaration ; comp. Whiner, $G r$. § 23. 5, p. $\mathrm{I}_{45}$. The partially proverbial statement which follows is illustrated by Wetstein in oc., and Schoettg. Hor. Hebr. Vol. I. p. 850 : the most pertinent quotation is Sereschith, xIV. I2, 'R. Henna dixit: fecit cum servum manumissum coram se ipso, ut si non labret non manducet.' The exhortation is expressed in the form of a kind of 'enthymeme' (Whately, Logic, II. 3.7, p. 121), the portion to be supplied being 'atqui quilibet edit; ergo quilibet laborato,' Beng. On the use of od following $\epsilon l$, when the negative is closely united with the verb, see notes on I Tim. iii. 5 , and the exx. collected by Winer, Gr. § 55.2 , p. $4^{23}$ sq., Gayer, de Part. Neg. ch. $\mathrm{\nabla}$. p. 99 sq .
 hear that there are some walking, \&c.;' ground for the reiteration of the Apostile's previous $\pi a \rho a \gamma \gamma e \lambda l a$. In cases like the present the predicative partisiple is not merely equivalent to an infinitive mood, but is idiomatically used as marking the state or action as now in existence, and coming before the observation of the writer as such ; see Whiner, Gr. § 45.4, p. 308 sq., where there is a good collection of dx.; comp. also Schmalfeld, Synt.
§ 217. 2, p. 437, and esp. the able tract of Weller (Bemerk. sum Gr. Syst. Meining. 1845 ), where the distinctions between the finite verb with of $\tau \tau$, with the infin., and with the participle, are carefully stated, and illustrated by numerous examples.
áтáкт的]
 d $\lambda \lambda$ de тєрเєр $\mathbf{\gamma}$.] 'doing no business, but being busy-bodies,' 'nihil operates, zed curios agentes,' Vulg., Clarom.,


16
 mantes nisi vana] Syr.; more exact specification of the preceding $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi$. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{u} \mu \hat{v} \nu \mathrm{a} \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \omega \mathrm{s}$ by means of a forcible paronomasia which cannot but be weakened in translation; comp. [De-
 $\kappa \alpha i l \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{\alpha} \zeta \eta$, and Quintin. Inst. Orat. vi. 3. 54, 'non agee dixit, ged stagere.' The verb $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \rho \gamma$. is a $a \pi a \xi$ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \mu$. in the N.T., and serves to mark
 the 'pravam curiositatem et sedulitalem' (Pelt), which marked the actions of those to whom the Apostle referred; contrast $\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon l \nu \tau a ̀$ at $\delta a$ in I Thess. iv. II, comp. $\pi \varepsilon \rho l \epsilon \rho \gamma o c$ in 1 Tim. v. $1_{3}$, and see the good notice of this verb in Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. iI. p. 67 o.
12. Toîs 8 È toloútots] 'Now to all such,' the article with rooovtos marking the whole class of persons that come under the same denomination, and have the same characteristics, as those previously mentioned; so Gal. v. 2 I. See Krüger, Sprachl. § 50. 4. 6, Jeff, $G r . \S 453$. $\beta$, and Kubner on Xe. Mem. 1. 5. 2.

#    

каі тарака入оиิнеv］＇andexhort（them），＇ ． iis］Syr．，－Tou＇s toooútous（Schott），or more simply aúzoús（Lïnem．），being here supplied zeugmatically，as it is called，to таракад．，which is only found with the accus．This $\pi$ apák $\lambda \eta$－
 that it has its proper force and effl－ cacy ；see notes on I Thess．iv．I， where $\pi$ apakaleiv is enhanced by the same addition．The reading can hardly be thought doubtful： $\bar{\nu} \mathrm{K} \nu \rho$ ，＇ $\mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$ ． $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\psi}$ is supported by $\mathrm{AB}\left(\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \nu\right.$ K．＇I．X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{u})$ FGN1 ${ }^{1} 4$ mss．；Vulg．， Goth．，Copt．，al．（Lachm．，Tisch．ed．7）． The reading of Rec．סıà tô̂ Kupiov $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$＇I $\eta \sigma 0 \hat{1}$ Xpıбтố only rests on the authority of $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KLN}^{4}$ ；most mss．；Chrys．，Theod．al．（Tisch．ed．2）． C is deficient．
$\mu \varepsilon \tau \dot{d}$ ทंनuxias］＇with quietness；＇in opposition to the busy and meddle－ some course of life followed by the
 § $\varnothing \mu \epsilon \nu 0 t$ ；see I Thess．iv．II．The pre－ position $\mu \in \tau$ d serves to point not to the＇causa instrumentalis＇（Kypke， Obs．Vol．I．p．143），but to the conco－ mitant of their working，一that which was associated with it，and character－ ized their＇modus operandi；＇comp． Winer，Gr．§47．h，p．337．On the derivation of $\dot{\eta} \sigma v x l a$ and its probable distinction from the less common $\eta^{\eta} \rho \epsilon$－ $\mu$ la，see notes on I Tim．ii． 2.
Tòv éautŵv äpтov］＇their own bread，＇ －＇their own＇（ $\tau \delta \nu \bar{\xi} \xi$ oikel $\omega \nu \pi \delta \nu \omega \nu$ ， Chrys．），not without emphasis；they were not to seek it at the hands of others（comp．ver．8），they were not ＇alienâ vivere quadrâ，＇Juven．Sat．
v．2．The sentiment is well illus－ trated by Schoettg．and Wetst．in loc． from the Rabbinical writings，out of which the following deserves citation ； ＇quo tempore homo panem proprium edit，animo composito ac sedato est； si vero panem parentum aut libero－ run comedit，non animo tam sedato est，ne dicam de pane peregrino，＇ Aboth R．Nathan，cap． 30 ．
 thren ；＇renewal of his address to those who were＇recte animati＇（Schott）， and lived orderly after the example which he had set them．Such the Apostle urges to pursue their course， and not from faintness to fall into idle， and eventually meddlesome and un－ quiet habits，like those he had just been condemning．$\quad \mu \eta$ ìvкак． ка入от．］＇lose not heart in well－doing．＇ The exact meaning of калотоє $\hat{\imath} \nu$ has been somewhat differently estimated． Several modern writers，following the hint，though not the exact interpr． （ $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \eta \eta_{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho l(\delta \eta \tau \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \mu \mu \hat{\varphi} \delta \iota \alpha \phi \theta a \rho \epsilon \in \nu \tau a s)$ of Chrys．，Theoph．，assign to the verb the idea of＇conferring benefits；＇the connexion between this and the pre－ ceding verse arising from the gentle contrast between the duty of living by their own labour，and the still further duty of conferring benefits on others； see Calv．in loc．As this meaning how－ ever seems to be lexically doubtful， see Lev．v． 4 （Cod．Coisl．，where калол． stands in antithesis to кaкоточ $\hat{\eta} \sigma a t$ ）， and as the more generic＇recte agere＇
 is perfectly in harmony with the con－ text，it seems best here，as in the very similar passage Gal．vi．9，to give

##  

$\kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \nu$ its less restricted meaning．The exact definition of this кa入d $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ lies in the specifications of the context．
On the form $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu_{\kappa} \alpha \kappa \in \hat{\epsilon} \nu \quad$［Lachm．，Tisch． with $\left.\mathrm{ABD}^{1} N\right]$ and the somewhat doubt－ ful kккакєì［Rec．］，see the remarks and distinctions in notes on Gal．l．c．
 word conveyed by the epistle； 1－ifor ［sermonibus nostris istis qui sunt in epistolầ］．It is doubtful whether dià $\tau \hat{\eta} s \ell \pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ is to be joined（a）with the following verb $\sigma \eta \mu \in t \circ \hat{0} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，or（ $b$ ） with the preceding subst．$\tau \Psi \lambda \bar{\psi} \gamma \varphi$ ，
 EEcum．The former is adopted by Ath．（Pol．），Beng．，Pelt，Winer（Gr． § 18．9．note 3，p．108），and others， either $\left(a_{1}\right)$ in the simple sense，＇notate in epistolâ，＇Eth．，acil．＇in epistolâ ad me scriptâ illum suis notis depin－ gite，＇Grot．，－$\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ referring to the letter which St Paul would in that case receive from the Thess．（see Winer）；or（ $a_{2}$ ）in the more artificial sense，＇$h d c$ epistolâ freti severius trac－ tate，＇Pelt（comp．Beng．），－$\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \mathrm{E}_{\iota-}$ oroג $\hat{\eta} s$ in that case referring to the present epistle．Of these last men－ tioned（ $a_{2}$ ）seems clearly forced and improbable，while（ $a_{1}$ ），though some－ what more plansible，lies open to the contextual objection that the present order of words would tend to throw an emphasis on $\bar{\partial} t \dot{d} ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ E \pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ．which cannot be accounted for，and further to the still graver exegetical objection that a letter would seem uncalled for after the precept in ver． 6 ，where the course to be pursued by the Thessalo－ nians is already stated．We retain then（b）with Syr．，not improbab＇y Vulg．，Copt．，Goth．［the exact orde
of the Greek is preserved］，Chrys． （appy．），Theoph．，Ecum．，and most modern expositors．The objec－ tion founded on the omission of the art．$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ after $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is not of weight，as $\delta \iota \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ．is so associated with $\tau \hat{\psi}$ $\lambda \sigma \gamma \varphi \dot{\eta} \mu$ ．as to form with it only a single idea；see exx．in Winer，Gr． §20．2，p．123．It may be observed that this is one of those cases in which the use of the art．in the N．T．seems slightly to differ from that in the best Attic Greek．While in the latter the article is rarely omitted，except after verbal substantives（Krüger，Sprachl． § 50．9．9），or where the structural connexion of the prepositional member with what precedes is palpably close， this omission of the art．in the N．T． is so far from unusual，that its inser－ tion usually implies some degree of emphasis；see Fritz．Rom．iii．25， Vol．I．p． 195 （note）．
$\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon\left\llcorner\hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta_{\epsilon}\right]$＇mark，＇－scil．by avoid－ ing his company（comp．ver．6），as more fully specified in the words which follow．So paraphrastically Syr． （20 comp．不th．－Platt．The verb $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon$ cou－ $\sigma \theta a l$ is a $a ̈ \pi . ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma 6 \mu$ ．in the N．T．：it properly implies in the active＇signo distinguere＇（Schott），c．g．Є̇ँ： $\sigma \phi \rho a \gamma i \delta \ell$, Dion．Hal．Antiq．Iv． 57 ， and thence in the middle＇sibi notare aliquid＇（Polyb．Hist．xxil．In．12），一 more correctly，according to the Atti－ cists，d $\pi$ об $\eta \mu \mathrm{alve} \mathrm{\sigma} \mathrm{\theta at}$（Thomas－Mag． p．791，Herodian，p．420，ed．Koch）， or as here，with a more intensive force，＇notâ（censoriâ）notare；＇the middle having what has been termed its ＇dynamic＇character，Krüger，sprachl． §52．8．4－For a large list of verbs of this class，see Schmalfeld，Synt．


 Kúpios $\mu \in \tau \alpha ̀$ ád $\dot{\nu} \tau \omega \nu \dot{\nu} \dot{\mu} \omega \hat{\omega}$ ．
§ 35，p． 44 sq．，and compare notes on Col．iv． 1.
 with；＇present，pointing to the course they were to follow．The double com－ pound $\sigma v \nu a \nu a \mu l \gamma \nu$ ．（Athen．Deipn．vi． 68 ，p． 256 A ）is used in a sense little differing from the simpler and more usual $\sigma v \mu \mu\langle\gamma \nu$ ．，and probably only in accordance with the noticeable ten－ dency of later Greek to accumulate prepositions in composition．The read－ ing is doubtful；Lachm．omits каl with $\mathrm{ABD}^{3} \mathrm{EN}$ ； 17 ；Clarom．，San－ germ．，Goth．，Copt．；Chrys．；Tert．， al．，－and reads $\sigma v \nu a \nu a \mu i \gamma v v \sigma \theta a l$ in which he is supported as to the termi－ nation by ABD ${ }^{1}$ EFGN；on this last reading it is impossible to pronounce from the Manuscript evidence，on ac－ count of the constant interchange of $\epsilon$ and al by itacism．Of the Versions Clarom．，Sangerm．，Copt．，Goth．，sup－ port the infinitive，Vulg．，Syr．，Au－ giens．，the imperative．
［va évтралñ］＇that he be shamed，＇＇ut confundatur，＇Vulg．；passive，－not with a middle sense，＇ad se ipsum quasi redire，＇Pelt（comp．Grot．，＇ut pudore tactus ad mentem meliorem redeat＇），－a meaning for which there seems no sufficient reason either here or in Tit．ii． 8 （where see notes）．The active occurs in I Cor．iv． 14.

15．kal does not stand＇here in． stead of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{a}^{\prime}$（Jowett；comp．De W．， ＇aber＇），－a most precarious statement， －but，with its usual and proper force，subjoins to the previous exhor－ tation a further one that was fully compatible with it，and in fact tended to show the real principle on which
the command was given：it was not punitive，but corrective．
 light of an enemy；＇the $\dot{\omega}$ being used （here almost pleonastically，comp．$\phi$ i－入ev $\gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho \sigma \epsilon \dot{\eta} \gamma 0 \hat{0} \mu a t$, Plato，Gorg．p． 473 A）to mark the aspect in which he was not to be regarded；comp．notes on ch．ii．2，and on Col．iii． 23 ．
On vou $\theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ ，see notes and reff．on I Thess．v．I2．

16．av่тòs 8 é к．т． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.$] ＇But may the$ Lord of peace Himself；＇the $\delta \in$（as in I Thess．$\dot{\mathrm{v}} .23$ ）putting in slight anti－ thesis the prayer with the foregoing exbortation，and the aúzòs enhancing the dignity of the subject ；comp．notes on ch．ii．I6，where however the anti－ thesis is somewhat more distinctly marked．On the meaning of the word $\epsilon i \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$ ，not merely＇concord＇（ $\dot{\prime} \sigma \tau \epsilon$
 Chrys．），but peace in its widest and Christian sense，－the deep tranquillity of a soul resting on God，see notes on Phil．iv． 7 ，and on the nature of the gen．，see notes on I Thess．v．23，－ but observe that $K$ úpoos can more readily be associated with the gen．as being allied to verbs that regularly govern that case；comp．Krüger， Sprachl．§ 47．26． 8.
Sıd тavтós к．т．入．］＇continually in every manner，＇－at all times（Matth． xviii．1о，Acts ii． 25 ，Rom．xi． 10 ， al．，comp．Ast，Lex．Platon．Vol．iII． p．63）and in every possible mode of manifestation，＇in omnibus quæ facitis，＇Ath．Pol．；ひ̈лтє $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \alpha u ̈ \tau \grave{̀} \nu$

 Theod．The second mode however

Autograph salutation and benediction.

enters but slightly into the contemplation of the Apostle, as there is nothing in the Ep. to make us think that $\tau \dot{d}$ cippucútiv $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ d ̀ \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda o u s$ had been seriously endangered or violated. The reading $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi a v \tau l \tau \dot{\prime} \pi \psi$, adopted by Lachm. with $A^{1} \mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$; 2 mss .; Vulg., Clarom., Goth.; Chrys. [see the note of Montfaucon], seems to have been suggested by the not uncommon occurrence of the formula ( I Cor. i . 2, 2 Cor. ii. 14, 1 Tim. ii. 8), and perhaps partially by the foregoing allusion to time. The reading of the text is supported by $\mathrm{A}^{2} \mathrm{BD}^{3} \mathrm{EKLN}$; nearly all mss.; Syr. (both), Copt., al.; Theod., Dam., and seems in every way more suitable to the context.
 tation by the hand of me Paul;' comp. I Cor. xvi. 2I, and Col. iv. 18. On the quasi-appositional genitive Maúlou, see exx. in Jelf, $G r$. §467. 4 . These words appy. form the commencement of the autograph salutation with which the Apostle attests the genuineness and authenticity of the Epistle (comp. notes on Gal. vi. if), the two verses having appy. both been written by the Apostle, - not merely ver. 18 ( $\tau \dot{o}$ ' H ха́рıs к.т.入.
 Theod., al.), which, as Lünem. rightly observes, could hardly be termed a direct $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi a \sigma \mu j$.
"] ' which thing;' not meaning, by attraction (see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 24 . 3, p. 150) to the following $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i=\nu$, 'which greeting,' but more simply and naturally referring to the preceding words, and to the general fact of their being written $\tau \hat{\eta} \epsilon_{\mu} \hat{\eta} \chi \epsilon \varphi \rho l \Pi a v i \lambda o v$. These autograph lines formed a $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ that the Ep. was not $\mathrm{\omega}^{\prime} \delta \delta^{\prime}$ aúrồ (ch.
ii. 2), but was truly and genuinely his own inspired composition.
 appy. with reference to every future
 Theoph. 2) which the Apostle might hereafter deem it necessary so to au-thenticate,-notmerely those he might have contemplated writing to Thessalonica (Theoph. I, Liinem.); for consider I Cor. xvi. 2 I , and Col. iv. 18. If it be urged that these last mentioned are the only Epp. in which the autograph attestation seems to have found a place, it may be reasonably answered that the $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta$ must be understood relatively of every Epistle that was sent in such a way or under such circumstances as to have needed it. All the other Epp. (except 1 Cor., Col., which have the $\sigma \eta \mu \in i o \nu$, and I Thess., which was sent before circumstances proved it to be necessary) are fairly shown both by De Wette and by Alf. in loc. to bave either been delivered by emissaries (2 Cor., Phil.), to bear such marks (Gal. vi. II, and perhaps the doxology in Rom., Eph.), or to be of such a general character (Rom.? Eph.? and those to individuals), as to bave rendered a formal attestation unnecessary.
oűt $\left.\omega \mathrm{s} \gamma \rho \alpha^{\prime} \phi \omega\right]$ 'so $I$ write ;' scil. in such characters as ver. 17 and 18 appeared to be written with. The suppositions that the Apostle bere in-

 or adopted a monogram ('conjunctis scilicet apte literis II et $\Lambda$,' according to Zeltner, de Monogr. Pauli, Altorf, 1721 ; see contra, Wolf in loc.), or lastly 'singulari et inimitabili picturâ et ductu literarum expressisse illud

## 136

 ПPO $\Theta E \Sigma \Sigma A \Lambda O N I K E I \Sigma$ B.
##  $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu . \quad\left[{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \cdot\right]$

18. ['A $\mu \eta^{\prime} \nu$ ] This is omitted by Tisch. (marked by Griesb. with ${ }^{00}$ ) with Bミ1; 17. 44. $67^{* *}$. i 16 ; Fuld., Harl., Tol.; Ambrst., -but retained by Rec. and Lachm. As it may not improbably be a liturgical interpolation it is the safest course to insert it in brackets. See notes on Tit. iii. I 5 .

Gratia, \&c.' (Beng.), -seem all far too artificial to deserve serious consideration The oür $\omega$ s simply and naturally points to the visible and recognisable difference between the handwriting of the transcriber and of the Apostle.

I8. ท $\mathfrak{\chi}$ X́ápis к.т. $\lambda$.] The same form of benediction as at the end of I Thess. (where see notes), except that the inclusive and significant $\pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ is here
added,-' all,'-even those who had deserved and received the Apostle's censure (comp. $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, ver. 16) were to share in his benediction and farewell prayer; see Pelt in loc., who however joins with it the less probable supposition, 'ne rixæ [none of which appear to have existed] disceptationesque Thessalonicenses turbarent.'

## TRANSLATION.

## NOTICE.

THE following translation has been revised in accordance with the principles laid down in former portions of this work. Experience seems satisfactorily to show that change is undesirable except where our Authorised Version is incorrect, inexact, insufficient, obscure (Pref. to Galatians, p. xxv), or inconsistent with itself in renderings of the less usual words or forms of expression (Notice to Transl. of Pastoral Epistles). The last form of correction is perhaps the most difficult to adjust, as our Translators expressly state that they have not been careful to preserve throughout their work a studied uniformity of translation, and consequently any attempt to do this regularly would reverse the principles on which they acted, and tend to produce what they avoided-dulness and monotony. Still in the same Epistle, and especially in the same context, it is so obviously desirable to be consistent, that here at least changes will have to be introduced. It must however always rest with individual judgment whether the word or expression in question is of such a character as to demand uniformity, or whether it is best left to take its hue from the context. That I have always been judicious in my decisions is more than I dare hope, but still I have striven to make them with a clear recognition of the general principles that characterize the noble Version which I am presuming to revise.

That these points may be more fully considered, and that my opinion, where seemingly capricious or precipitate, may be more completely tested, I have made a few additions to the notes in the shape of reasons for the changes adopted, and I have further
sought to add to the common stock of principles of revision a brief record of my own experiences and my own many difficulties. Sincerely and earnestly do I trust that the revision of our Authorised Version may be undertaken in its own good time, and that that time is not indefinitely remote, still year after year I am made more sensibly to feel that this can only be done by a frank and modest avowal, on the part of every one who has gained any experience, of the real difficulties that attend on the work,-difficulties far more numerous than the inexact and often presumptuous criticism of the day is at all aware of.

I have carefully considered the Revised Translation of these Epistles published by the American Bible Union (Truibner, London, 1856 ), and have in a few cases profited by its suggestions, still I cannot but feel that this laborious work is at present very far from what we may imagine to be the model of a national Revision.

It may be as well to notice here that the translation of Wiclif is quoted from the New Testament published by Pickering in r848; that Coverdale's Testament of 1538 is cited from the Paris edition; that the edition of Cranmer employed is that of April 1540; that the Genevan Version is given from the first edition 1560; and that the citations from the Bishops' Bible are made from the first edition 1568 . For the remaining Versions, of Tyndale and Coverdale, the Rhemish and the Authorised, I have used Bagster's reprints.

## THE

## FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

PAUL and Silvanus and Timothy to the church of the 1. Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be to you and peace.

We give thanks to God always for you all, making 2 mention of you in our prayers; remembering without 3 ceasing your work of faith, and toil of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the presence of God and our Father : knowing, brethren beloved of God, your 4 election; because our Gospel came not unto you in word 5

[^2]only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost and in much assurance; even as ye know what manner of men
6 we became among you for your sake. And ye became followers of us and of the Lord, having received the word
7 in much affliction with joy of the Holy Ghost ; so that ye became an ensample to all that believe in Macedonia and 8 in Achaia. For from you hath sounded forth the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place your faith to God-ward is gone forth; so that
9 we need not to speak anything. For they themselves report of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned unto God from idols to serve the Io living and true God ; and to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus who delivereth us from the coming wrath.

Vv. except Ryem., that. Even as] $A s$, Adth. and all $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. It is almost impossible to lay down any exact rule for the translation of $\kappa \alpha \theta \omega \omega^{\prime}$. Whether the lighter 'as,' or the more expressive and perhaps more literal 'even as' or 'according as' is to be adopted, must appy. be left wholly to the context and to individual judgment.
Became] Behaued oure selves, Trnd., Cran.; haue ben, Cov. Test., Rhem.; were, Adth. and remaining Vv.
6. Followers] So AUTH. and all Vv. Though 'imitators' would be more exact, it is hardly necessary to displace the present idiomatic and perfectly intelligible translation.
7. Became an ensample] Sim., are lecome an ens., Cov. Test.: were * $\epsilon n$ samples, Aठтн.; were an ensample, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish.
And in Achaia] And "Achaia, Aute.
8. Hath sounded forth] Sounded out, Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish. The perfect ought always to be observed in translation. Though idiom may occasionally require the
aorist to be translated with the usual sign of the perfect, the converse is extremely rare; comp. 2 Cor. i. 9. $B u t] B u t^{*}$ also, AUTH.
Is gone forth] Sim. Cov. Test. (is gone out) : is spread abroad, AUTH., Cov., BisH.; spred her silfe abroade, Trnd., Cran.; is proceded, Rhem.
9. Report] So Rhem.: shew, Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{VV}_{\mathrm{v}}$ Turned] Returned, Aणтf. ed. 1611 , as given in the English Hexapla.
10. From heaven] So Adxi. and all Vv. except WIcl., fro heuenes. Many modern Vv. preserve both the article and the plural, but with the familiar usage of the word in the N.T. (e.g. Matth. vi. g) before us it seems in general passages like the present both harsh and unnecessary to be thus literally precise. .Who] So Rhem. : which, Auth.
Delivereth] So Trnd., Cban., Gen., Bism. : delivered, Auth., Wicl. ; hath delyuered, Cov. (both), Rhem.
Coming wrath] Wrath to come, Adti, and all $\mathrm{V} v$. (w. to comynge, WıcL.).

For yourselves know, brethren, our entering in unto II. you that it hath not been vain : but after that we had suf- 2 fered before, and had been shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi, we were bold of speech in our God, so as to speak unto you the Gospel of God in much conflict. For our exhortation is not of error, nor yet of unclean- 3

Chaprer II. i. Know, brethren] So, in the same order, Tynd., Gen., Rhem.: brethren, know, Atth., Cov., Cran., Bish. There seems here no cause for departing from the order of the original.

Entering]
Entrance, Auth. There is no reason why the rendering adopted in ch. i. 9 should not be retained.
Hath not been] Was not, Autr. and all Vv. Vain] So Wicl., RHem.: in vain, Adte, and remaining $\nabla v$.
2. But after] But *even after, Aure. Had been shamefully entr.] Were shamefully entr., Auth., Trnd., Cran., Gen., Bish. The other Vv . vary the translation of the participle; Cov. gives, but as we had suffred aforc, \&e were, \&c.: Cov. Test., but we suffred...and were...and were boldened: and Reem., but hauing suffered before and been abused, \&c. If the view taken in the notes be correct, it seems best to regard both participles as temporal, and to express them both by the idiomatic resolution into the English pluperfect. On the translation of the aorist part. when associated with the finite verb, see notes on Phil. ii. 30 (Transl.). Were bold of speech] Were bold, Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., hadde triste ; Cov. Test., were boldened; and Rhem., had confidence: see notes in loc.
So as to speak] To speak, Auth. and all Vv . (for to sp., Wicl.). The introduction of 'so as' seems necessary to exhibit the explanatory nature of the infinitive, and to avoid tautology.

In (3)] So Wicl., Cov. Test., Cban., Bish., Rhem. : * with, Adtr., Tynd., Cov., Gen. Confict] So Auth. in Col. ii. r, giving contention here. There is much variation in the translation here: Bisynesse, WIcl.; carefulnesse, Cov. Test., Reme (these three following the Vulg. sollicitudinc) ; strivynge, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
3. Is] Was, Aute. and all Vv . Error] So all Vv. except Auth., Gen., Bish., deceit. Nor yet...nor] Nor yet...nether, Tynd., Cov., Cran.; nor...nor, Auth., Cov. Test., Gen.; nether...nether, Wicl., Bish.; not... nor, Rнem. There is some little difficulty in the choice of an appropriate rendering in the different cases of continued negation. Perbaps the following distinctions of translation may be found generally satisfactory in appli-
 commonly admit the translation (a) 'not...neither,' when the two words or clauses to which the negation is prefixed are simply parallel and coordinate, e.g. Matth. vii. 6; (b)'not ...nor,' when there is some sort of connexion in thought, or accordance in meaning, in the words or clauses with which the negatives are associated, e.g.ch. v. 5 ; (c) 'not...nor yet,' where there is less accordance, and whers the latter clause has somewhat of a climactic character, e.g. Phil. ii. 16, and see notes to Transl. (2) M $\grave{\eta} . . . \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \ldots \mu \eta \delta \epsilon$, 'not...nor...nor' (John i. 13), where the terms are similar or non-ascensive, or 'not'

4 ness, nor in guile: but according as we have been approved of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God which proveth 5 our hearts. For neither at any time used we speech of flattery, as ye know, nor a cloke of covetousness; God is
6 witness: neither seeking glory of men, neither of you nor of others, though we might have used authority as Christ's
7 apostles. But we were gentle in the midst of you, like as 8 a nurse cherisheth her own children; so, being affectionately desirous of you, we had good will to impart to
followed by 'nor...nor yet,' as perhaps Col. ii. 2.1 (but see notes), or by 'nor yet...nor,' as here, according as the dissimilarity or climactic force is mainly exhibited in the second or in the third term. (3) Mì... $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \ldots \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, ' not...neither...nor;' where the first negation, so to say, bifurcates, and is expanded into two similar clauses introduced each by the adjunctive $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \epsilon$; comp. Auth. in I Tim. i. 7. In cases where there are three or more repetitions of $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, our Authorised Version appears to adopt in the main (3), repeating 'neither' after 'nor;' comp. Matth. v. 34, Luke ix. 3.
4. According as] A8, AUTH. and all Vv. It has been before observed that the introduction of 'according' or 'even' must depend on the general hue of the passage : here it seems necessary. Have been] Were, Auti. Approved] So RHem.; sim. prouede, Wiol. : allowed, Auti. and remaining Vv. Proveth] So Wiol., Rhem.: trieth, Auth. and remaining VV. Wicl. and RHEM. are the only VV. which preserve the paronomasia in $\delta \in \delta о к \iota \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta a \ldots$... $о к \iota \mu \dot{\alpha}-$ soutl.
5. Speech of flattery] Somewhat similarly, worde of glosynge, WICL; the voord of adulation, RHEM.: fattering words, AUTH. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$
6. Neither seeking] So WICL., and (giving nor) Cov. Test., RHem.: nor... sought we, AUTH., and so the remaining Vv., except that they more correctly adopt neither at the commencement of the clauses. In somecases, especially in St Paul's Epp., it is almost impossible to give an idiomatic translation without converting the participle into a finite verb (comp. Rom xii. 9 sq.) : here however there is no such necessity.
Nor] So rightly Wicl. (nether), Cov. (both), GEN., RHEm.: nor yet, AUTH., Tynd., Cran., Bish. Though] Vvhereas, RHEM.; when, Adti. and remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ Have used authority] So Auth. Marg.: be charge to you, Wiol. ; have bene chargeable, TYnd., Cov. (both) [adding vnito you], Gen.; haue bene $i$ auctorite, Cran., Bish.; haue been a burden to you, Rнem.; have been burdensome, AUTH. (Vulg, here adds vobis).
Christ's apostles] So WicL : the Apostles of Christ, AUTH. and remaining Vv. (Cov. Test. omits the).
7. In the midst of] So Wicl. (mydil), RHEm.: among, AuTH. and remaining Vv. Like as]
So Cov.: even as, Aute.
Her own] Her, A oth. and all Vv.
8. We had good will to] Somewhat similariy,'oure good will was to, TYND., Cran., Gen., Bish.; we...wolde with good wyl, Cov.: we were willing to,
you, not the Gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye became very dear to us. For ye remember, 9 brethren, our toil and travail : working night and day, that we might not be burdensome to any of you, preached we unto you the Gospel of God. Ye are witnesses, and io so is God, how holily and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves to you that believe; even as you know II how in regard of every one of you we did so, as a father toward his own children, exborting you and encouraging you, and testifying that ye should walk worthy of God 12 who is calling you into His own kingdom and glory.

AUtr.; we... wolden, Widl., Cov. Test.; vive would gladly, Rhem. Eúסoкeì occurs again in ch. iii. I, 2 Thess. ii. 12, but it is not possible to preserve a uniform translation.
Impart] So, as to the tense of the infin., Wicl. (bitake), Rhem. (deliuer): have imparted, Aotr.; have dealle, Trnd. and the five remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Became] Similarly Wicl., ben made; and Rhem., are become: were, Auth. and remaining $V_{\nabla}$. Very dear] Similarly Cov. Test., Reem., most deare; and Wicl., most derworth: dear, Auth. and remaining $V_{\mathrm{v}}$.
9. Toil] Labour, Aоth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., traueyl (giving werynesse for $\mu \dot{\delta} \chi \theta o \nu$ ). See notes on ch. i. 3 (Transl.).
Working] So Wicl., Rhem.: * for labouring, A ©TH. It is well to translate

That we might not, \&c.] Because we would not be chargeable unto, Аотн., Trnd. (greveous), Cov., Cran., Gen., Bisn.; that we schulden not greue, Wicl.; leste we shulde be chargeagle vnto, Cov.Test. ; lest veeshould charge, Rhem.
Preached we] We preached, Adtr. The inversion seems to give a slight force, and to keep in more immediate connexion the participle and its finite verb.
10. So is God] So Trnd., Cov. (both), Cran.: God also, Auth., Gen., Bish.; God, Widl., Reem. To you] So Wicl., Rhem. : among you, Adte. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Cov. Test., wyth you.
II. Even as] As, Aoth. and all Vv. How in regard of, \&c.] How we exhorted and comforted, and charged every one of you, (as a father doeth his children, ), Adth.: Cran. alone preserves the correct construction, though with a somewhat free translation, how that we bare soch affecyon vnto every one of you, as a father doth vinto chyldren, exhortynge, confortyng, and besechyng you that, \&c. This also seems the more correct position for the clause is $\pi a \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, except that it somewhat interferes with the easy run of the sentence. His own] As above in ver. $7:$ his, Adth. and all Vv. except Cran., which omits the pronoun.

Exhorting you] A0th. omits you here; and does not supply it after the following word.
Encouraging] Aठtr. and all V8. use the word comfort for $\pi$ apaкa入oîures here: for the constr. of Aणti. see above. Testifying] So Autr. for $\mu a \rho r u ́ p \in \sigma \theta a l$ in Gal. v. 3 ; Eph. iv. 17 ; here it employs * charge, reading цартирои́цєуо.
12. Should] So Wicl.: would,

I3 For this cause we also thank God without ceasing, that when ye received from us the word of preaching that is of God, ye accepted not the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, which worketh also in you 14 that believe. For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which are in Judæa in Christ Jesus, in that ye also suffered the same things of your own countryI 5 men as they too did of the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove us out, and please 16 not God, and are contrary to all men, hindering us from

Avte. and remaining $V \mathbf{v}$. Is calling] Hath called, Auth. and the other $V_{v}$. except Wicl., clepide. Into] So Wicl., Reem. : unto, Auth. and remaining $V_{v}$.

His own] His, Auth, and all Vv.
13. 'We also thank] Also thank we, Auth., Gen.: as kai belongs to $\dot{\eta} \mu c i i^{\prime}$ it is better to adopt the order of the text; sim. Cov. Test., Reem. That (before when)] So Gen.: because, Auth., Bish.; for, Wicl.; because that, Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Reey. From us the word of, \& c .] Very similarly, of vs the worde of the preachinge of God, Cov. (both), Gen.: the word of God, which ye heard of us, Aणth.; of vs the worde of the herynge of god, Wicl., Rнem. ; of ess the worde wherwith God was preached, Trnd.; of vs $y$ worde (wherwith ye learned to know God), Cran.; the worde which ye hearde of vs concernying God, Bish.
Accepted] Received, AUth. and all other Vv. except Wicl. (token, giving hadden take before). It is desirable to show by the translation that two words are used, $\pi a \rho a \lambda a \beta b \nu \tau \epsilon s . . . \varepsilon \delta \epsilon \xi a \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Vulg. uses accipere in both cases.
Not] It not as, Auti. and all Vv., and so Vulg. Worketh] So all Vv. except Auth., Bish., effectually worketh. See also Autr. in James v. 16. The force of $\dot{\epsilon} \varphi \rho-$
$\gamma_{\epsilon \in i \sigma \theta a t, ~ ' e x ~ s e ~ v i m ~ s u a m ~ e x e r c e r e, ' ~}^{\text {, }}$ cannot easily be expressed in English: 'to work' seems hardly sufficient on the one hand; 'to work effectually' somewhat too strong on the other. The most exact translation is perhaps 'to evince (its) working,' but is not in harmony with the tone of our Authorised Version.
14. Followers] See note on ch. i. 6 (Transl.). Are in J.] So Wicl., Cov.Test., Rhem.,following the Vulg.: in J. are, Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
In that] Similarly Gen., because: so that, Cov.; for, AUti. and remaining Vr. Suffered] Have suffered, Autr. and all Vv. The same] So Wicl., Gen., Rhem. : soch, Cov. Test.; like, Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. As they too did] Even as they have, Auth.
15. Killed both] Both killed, Aute., Gen., Bise., Reem. The prophets] *Their own Pr., Autr. Drove us out] Haue chased vs out, AUtr. Marg.; pursuen vs, Wiol.; haue persued vs, Cov. Test. ; have persecuted us, Aоtн. and 6 remaining $V_{v}$.
Please not God] So Cov., Cov. Test. (do not pl.), Rhem.: they please not God, Auth., Wicl. (to g.) ; God they please not, Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.
16. Hindering] And hynder, Cran., Bish. ; forbidding, Auth., Wicl.,
speaking to the Gentiles that they might be saved,-in order to fill up their sins alway. But the wrath is come upon them unto the very end.

But we, brethren, having been torn from you for a 17 short time, in face, not in heart, the more abundantly en-

Cov. (both) ; and forbid, Tynd., GEN.; prohibiting, Rнем. Though the transl, given by Auth. is the usual one of $\kappa \omega \lambda u ́ \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ and cannot be called incorrect, yet that adopted in the text is here far more forcible. From speaking] To speak, Auth.; see previous note. In order to fill up] To fill up, Auth. But] For, Auth. and all Vv. (forsothe, WIcl.). Vulg. here gives enim for $\delta \epsilon$.
Is come] So Auth. and all Vv. (Cov. adds allready) except Wicl., bifore came. This certainly seems one of those cases in which our English aorist does not convey the full force of the Greek, but remands the event too absolutely to the past. While the Greek ${ }^{\prime} \phi \theta a \sigma \epsilon$ states the fact, but is simply silent as to 'quam late pateat id quod actum est' (see notes in loc.), the English 'came' seems to express it, and also to imply distinctly that the event with all its issues plainly belongs to the past. Unto the very end] Til into the ende, Wiol.; euen to the end, Rнем.; both following the Vulg.: to the uttermost, Auth., Cov. (vnto $y^{*}$ vttemost), GEN. (vtmoste), BISE. (vtm.) ; even to the vtmost, TYND., Cran. ; vintyll the vttemost, Cov. Test. The translation adopted in the text perhaps more precisely renders $\phi \theta \alpha^{\prime} \nu \in \iota$ $\epsilon l s \tau \epsilon \lambda$ os than the more qualitative and appy. adverbial 'to the uttermost;' see notes in loc.

1\%. Having been torn from you] Being taken from you, AUTH. ; desolate fro you, Wicl.; for as moch...as we are kept from you, Tynd., Cov. (haue bene), Cran., Gen. (were), Bish.; beynge
kepte frō you, Cov. Test. ; depriued of you, RHem. It is almost impossible to represent in English without a paraphrase the highly expressive $a^{3} \pi n \rho \phi \alpha-$ $\nu / \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, which serves so forcibly to convey not only the separation and severance of the Apostle from his converts, but also his desolate and bereaved state while so separated. The present translation, adopted by Murdoch (Transl. of Syr. N.T.), Peile, and others, seems to approach this meaning as nearly as any single word that has yet been suggested.
Face] Presence, Auth.: $\pi$ pó $\sigma \omega \pi o v$ is translated face in the next clause.
The more abundantly endeavoured] More aboundauntlyhauehiyede, Wicl. : end. the more abundantly, Auth. ; enforsed the more, Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; haue haisted the move, Cov.; hasted more spedely, Cov. Test.; haue hastened the more aboundantly, RHEM. Though all the Vv. except Wiol. put the adverb after and not before the verb, the latter order is perhapa to be preferred, as throwing the emphasis more distinctly on the 'more abundantly.' It may be observed that much caution must be used in adjusting the order of the words in English with regard to emphasis; for while in Greek the emphatic word seems always to have the precedence, the attentive reader will often observe that the con. trary is the case in English. In the position of the verb and adverb however the two languages seem to be mainly coincident. The discrepancy between the English and the Greek position of emphasis has been far too

I8 deavoured to see your face with great desire. On which account we would fain have come unto you, even I Paul,
19 both once and again, -and Satan hindered us. For what is our hope or joy or crown of boasting? Or is it not also you in the presence of our Lord Jesus at His coming?
20 Verily ye are our glory and joy.
III. Wherefore when we could no longer forbear, we

2 thought it good to be left behind at Athens alone; and sent Timothy, our brother and fellow-worker with God in the Gospel of Christ, to establish you, and to exhort you
3 in behalf of your faith that no man be disquieted in these
much neglected by modern revisers, many of whom seem to think that in all cases the most complete faithfulness is attained by rigidly following the order of the original; see for example the canons laid down by Wade, Notes on the Revised Transl. of St John, p. iv.
18. On which account] *Wherefore, Auth. Would fain] Would, Aणtr. and all Vv. Few words cause more difficulty to the translator of the N.T. than the verb $\theta \in \lambda \omega$ : 'wish' is commonly much too weak, 'desire' not always exact, and 'will' and 'would' often liable to be mistaken for mere auxiliaries. In many cases the Translators of our Version appear to have availed themselves of the past tense 'would' as a very suitable and idiomatic translation of the present $\theta \in \lambda \omega$; comp. Rom. vii. 15 sq. Here however it is open to the misconception ahove alluded to.
Both once] Once, Auth. And (2)] But, Aoter and all Vv .
19. Boasting] Rejoicing, Aute, and the other $V_{v}$. except Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem., glorie (glorice, Vulg.).
Or is it not also you] Whether yee ben not, Wicl.: are not even ye, Aणth.; are not eué you it, Gen. : are not ye it, Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Bise.; are not you, Rhem. It will thus be
seen that Wicl. alone offers any equivalent to $\hat{\eta}$ oủxl (nonne, Vulg.), and that кal is preserved only by Adtr., Gen. It is frequently difficult to decide whether in interrogations introduced by $\dot{\eta}$ oux ${ }^{l}$ the $\dot{\eta}$ is to be regarded as only giving a greater vividness and abruptness to the question, almost 'What! are not, dec.,' or as really retaining its proper disjunctive force. In the present case, and in more perhaps than are usually so regarded, the latter seems the more correct view. Lord Jesus] Lord Jesus * Christ, Autr.
20. Verily] Similarly, yes, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; forsothe, Wicl. ; for, A dth., Cov.Test., Rhem.

Ceapter III. I. Thought it good] On the transl. of cúdoкєiv, see note on ch. ii. 8 (Transl.). Be left behind] Be left, Auth.; dwelle, Wicl. ; remayne, Tynd. and six remaining Vv.
2. Timothy] Timotheus, Auth.: see notes on Col. i. г (Transl.).
And fellow-worker with God] And *minister of God, and our fellowlabourer, AUTH. Exhort] So Cov. Test., Rhem. (ad...exhortandos, Vulg.) : comfort, Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
In behalf of $]$ * Concerning, Adth.
afflictions: for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto. For verily, when we were with you, we told 4 you before that we were to be afflicted; as also it came to pass, and ye know. For this cause, when I too could 5 no longer forbear, I sent with a view of knowing your faith, lest haply the tempter have tempted you, and our toil should prove in vain.

But now when Timothy came unto us from you, and 6 brought us the good tidings of your faith and love, and that ye have good remembrance of us always, longing to see us, as we also to see you,-for this cause were we 7
3. Be] So Wicl., Reem.: should $b e$, Auth, and remaining $V \nabla$.
Disquieted] Moved, Auth. and all Vv. As the word is peculiar and a ämak $\lambda_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{o}_{\mu \epsilon \nu} \nu$, it is better to give it a distinguishing translation. $\quad I n]$ So all Vv. except Auti., by; and Gri., with.
4. Were to be aflicted] Should suffer tribulation, Auth. and all Vv. Wicl., Cov. Test., Gen., Reem., howevergive tribulacoñs (vs to suffre t., Wicl.).
As also] So Cov. Test. (putting also after passe), Reem.; as \& Wicl. : even as, Auty, and remaining $\nabla \mathrm{v}$.
5. I too] Sim., I also, Reem.: Atte. and remaining Vv. except Wiol. (which gives \& I poul) omit to translate кal. With a view of knowing] To know, AUtr., Wiol. (for to), Cov. Test., Bish., Rhem.; $y^{i} I$ mighte kn. of, Gen.; that Imyght have knowledge of, Tind., Cov., Cran. Haply] So Trnd., Cov. (botb); and sim., parauenture, Wicl.; perhaps, Rhem. : by some means, Auth., Cran., Bise.; in any sorte, Gen. Have tempted] So Auth., Cov. Test., Rhem. (hath): had t., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. Wiol. gives schal tempte. Neither translation is quite exact or strictly idiomatic; the English perfect however seems here to approach more
nearly to the present use of the Greek aorist than the pluperfect, and perhaps, owing to the peculiar form of the expression in the original, may be considered as admissible in point of English. Toil] Labour, Auth. See notes on ch. i. 3 (Transl.).
Should prove] Be, Auti.; be made, Wicl., Cov. Test., Reem. ; had bene bestowed, Tynd., Cran.; had bene, Cov., Gen., Bish.
6. Timothy] Timotheus, Aणti. : see notes on Col. i. i (Transl.). Unte us from youl So Wicl. (to), Cov. Test., Rhem. : from you unto us, Auth. and remaining $V_{\nabla}$, ,-a departure from the order in the Greek for which there does not here seem any satisfactory reason. The good tidings] Good t., Auti. Love] So Trnd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. : charity, Auth., Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem. On this correction see notes on I Tim. i. 5 (Transl.).

Longing] Desiring greatly, Autr. ; desirynge, Wicl. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$ : the $\epsilon \pi l$ in $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi t \pi \circ \theta \epsilon \hat{v}$ is not intensive; see notes. Cov. gives, desyringe to se vs as we also longe to se you.
7. For this cause] Therefore, A UTH. and all $V_{v}$.

Were we] We were, Autir. The transposition seems to keep the sentence a little closer toge-
comforted, brethren, over you in all our necessity and 8 affliction by your faith: since now we live, if ye stand 9 fast in the Lord. For what thanksgiving can we render to God for you, for all the joy which we joy for your sakes 10 in the presence of our God; night and day praying very exceedingly that we may see your face and supply the lacking measures of your faith ?
i I Now may God Himself and our Father and our Lord 12 Jesus Christ direct our way unto you. But you may the Lord make to increase and abound in your love towards one another and towards all men, even as we also
ther, and is frequently adopted in Auri. Brethren] So, in this order, Rhem. : Auth. and remaining Vv. append it to therefore. Here it seems more exact to retain the order of the Greek.

Necessity and afliction] Afliction and distress, AUth. There is no cause for forsaking the ordinary rendering of $\alpha{ }^{2} \dot{a} \gamma \kappa \overline{ } \eta$ which is preserved by 6 Versions. Auth. has here distress: Wiol. and Cov. Test. give nede.
8. Since] For, A DTH. and the other Vr. except RHEM., because. Here the particle ö́ct seemus scarcely to have so full a force as 'because,' and yet to be somewhat stronger than 'for,'-which, as a general rule, it is desirable to reserve as the translation of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$.
9. Thanksgiving] So Cov. Test., Rhem., and sim. Wiol. (doinge of thankyngis): thanks, Aotr. and remaining Vv. Render to God] So Cov. Test. (ento), Rhem. , and similarly Wicl. (yilde to god) : render to God again, Auth. ; recompence to god agayne, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Biss. Which] Similarly, that, Tynd., Cov. (that we haue concernynge you before oure G.), Cban. : wherewith Auth., Cov. Test., Gen., Bish.,Rhem.; in whiche, Wicl.
In the presence of $]$ Before, Аотн. and all Vv.; see notes on ch. i. 3 (Trarsl.).
10. Very exceedingly] Exceedingly, Auti. See ch. v. 13, Eph. iii. 20, the only places where this emphatic compound $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \kappa \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \circ \hat{v}\left[-\hat{\omega}_{s}\right]$ occurs.
May] So Cov. Test., Rhem.: might, Auth. Supply, \&c.] Might perfect that which is lacking in, Auti., and sim. Trnd. and Cov. (both giving fulfil), Gen. (accöplish); fulfille tho thingis that faylen of, Wicl.; to fulfyll the thynges that are lackyng vnto, Cov. Test., Cban. (myght...which); repayre the wantynges of, BisF.; may accomplish those things that veant of, Rhey. Cov. omits might (2).
it. May God] Auti. and the other Vv. omit may, which however seems to add perspicuity to the sentence (Cran. gives wrongly God...shall).
12. But you may the Lord make] And the Lord make you, A OTE. But is rightly given by Cov. (both). Though there is perhaps some little awkwardness in the prominence given to the pronoun, it seems required to convey to the English reader the antithesis of the original; see notes. $\quad$ Your] So Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem., following the Vulg. It is better to insert the pronoun in tramsl. though it is here omitted by Aurn. and remaining Vv. Towards one another] One towards another, Auth. We also] So Cov. Test., Bish., Rhem.:
abound towards you; to the end He may stablish your 13 hearts unblameable in holiness in the presence of God and our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all His saints.

Furthermore then, brethren, we beseech you and ex- IV. hort you in the Lord Jesus, that as ye received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, as indeed ye are walking-that so ye would abound still more. For ye 2 know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus. For this is the will of God, even your sanctifica- 3 tion, to wit that ye abstain from Fornication,--that every 4 one of you know how to get himself his own vessel in sanctification and honour, not in lustfulness of desire, 5 even as the Gentiles also which know not God; that no 6
we, Auth. omitting kal in translation. Abound (2)] Do, Aणth.
$\mathrm{I}_{3}$. In the presence of] Before, Auth. and all Vv. : see notes on ch. i. 3 (Transl.). God and our Father] So Wiol., Cov. Test., Bish., Reem.: God even our Father, Auth., Gen.; God oure father, Tynd., Cov., Cran. On the best mode of translating this august formula, see notes on Gal. i. 4 (Transl.). Lord Jesus] Lord Jesus* Christ, Aоtн.

Cenpter IV. i. Furthermore] So Auti. and the other Vv. except Wicl., hensforthwarde; and Rhem., for the rest. This translation of入oımò $\nu$ is perhaps not exactly literal, but seems sufficiently approximate : 'finally' would here be hardly appropriate, and 'for the rest' (RHEm.), though literal, is both harsh and awkward.
Brethren, we] So Cov. Test., Rhem., and similarly Wicl. (therfore br. hens. $w e)$ : AणTH. and remaining $V v$. insert $b r$. after you, -but not in accordance with the Greek order. In] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen., Rhem.: by,

Auth., Cran., Bish. Received 1
Have received, Aote. and all Vv.
As indeed ye are walking] Auti. *omits this clause. That so] A OTH. omits *that. Still more] More and more, Auth. and the other Vv. except Wiol., Rhem., more; and Cov. Test., which gives that ye maye be more plentyfullyer.
3. To wit that ye] Sim., that yee, Wicl., Cov. Test., Reem. (you) : that ye should, Auth., Cov., Cran., Bish.; and that ye shuld, Tynd., Gen.-but Tynd. translates the preceding clause even that ye shuld be holy: Gen. as Aणtif.
4. Know] Should know, Aotr. This clause is parallel to the preceding 'to wit that,' de. Get himself] Posess, Auth., Gen., Bish., Reem.; veelde [i.e. wield] Wicl.; kepe, Tynd., Cov., Cran.; vae, Cov. Test. His own] His, Aот日. and all Vv.
5. Lustfulness of desire] Sim., passioun of desire, Wicl. : the passion of lust, Reem. ; the lust of concupiscence, Aотн. and remaining $V$ v.
Gentiles also] Autn. omits kal in translation.
man go beyond and overreach his brother in the matter : because that the Lord is the avenger of all these things, 7 as also we before told you and did solemnly testify. For God called us not for uncleanness, but in sanctification.
8 Wherefore then he that rejecteth rejecteth not man but God, who also gave His Holy Spirit unto you.
9 Now as touching brotherly love ye need not that I write to you ; for ye yourselves are taught of God to love to one another: for indeed ye do it towards all the brethren that are in the whole of Macedonia. But we exhort you,
6. Overreach] So Auti. Marg. (oppresse, or, ouerreach : deceyue, WICL.; begyle, Cov.Test. ; circumuent, Rhem. (all three from Vulg., circumveniat); defraud, Auth. and 5 remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The matter] So Auth. Marg.: any matter, Auth., Gen., Bish.; bargayninge, Tind., Cov. (both), Cran.; businesse, Rhem. All these things] So Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem. : all such, Aute., Bish.; all suche thinges, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.
As also, \&c.] As we also have forewarned you, and testified, Auth., Bisn. The renderings of the other $V_{\nabla}$. are here added as they exhibit a singular variety of translation in a simple clause. As we bifore seyden to you, \& haue witnesside (or prouede by autorite), Wicl. ; as we tolde you before tyme and testified, Tynd., Cran. (om. tyme); as we haue sayde testified onto you afore tyme, Cov.; as we haue sayd and witnessed vnto you before, Cov. Test.; as we also haue tolde you before time and testified, Gen.; as vev haue foretold you, and haue testified, Rhem. The slight change to 'did testify' is made for the sake of preserving a sort of rhythm; comp. notes on Phil. ii. 16 (Transl.).
7. Called us not] Clepide not vs, Wicl.; hath not called us, Aote. and remaining Vv . For (2)...in] To ...vnto, Cov.; vnto...into, Bish. ; into
(bis), Wicl., Reem.; unto (bis), Auth. and 4 remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. It is probably a mere accident that Cov. and Bish. preserve a difference in rendering between $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ and $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$. Sanctification] So Reem. : holiness, Auth. It is well to preserve uniformity of translation with ver. 3,4 .
8. Wherefore then he] And so he, Widl.; wherfore he, Cov. Test.; therfore he, Reem.; he therefore, Auth. and remaining Vv. Rejecteth (bis)]So Aute. Marg.: despiseth, A Uth. and all Vv. Wicl., Cov. Test., Gen., Reem., iusert thes thingis after the first dispisith (Vulg. haec). Gave] So Wicl.: hath sent, Tynd., Cran.; hath...given, A $\quad$ tri. and remaining $V \mathrm{v}$. His Holy Spirit unto you] Unto *us his holy Spirit, АЈтн. ; his holy spirit in vs, Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem.; his holy sprete amonge you, Tynd., Cran. ; his holy sprete in to you, Cov. ; you his holie Spirit, GEn.; to you his h. s., Bish.
9. Now] But, Adtr. and all Vv. except Wicl. (forsothe).
10. For indeed] And in deed, Aоte; \& forsothe, WICL. ; for, Cov. Test.; ye and...verely, Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; yee and, Cov., Remem.
That] Which, Auti. The whole of M.] Whole M., Cov. Test. : all M., AUTH. and remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Exhort] Beseech, Aסrif.: see ver. I.
brethren, to abound still more, and to study to be quiet, i I and to do your own business, and to work with your hands, according as we commanded you; in order that 12 ye may walk becomingly toward them that are without, and may have need of no man.

Now we would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, 13 concerning them that are sleeping, that ye sorrow not, even as the rest which have no hope. For if we believe that 14 Jesus died and rose again, even so them that are laid to sleep through Jesus will God bring with Him. For this 15 we say to you in the word of the Lord, that we which are

To abound] That yee abounde, Wicc., Rhem. (you); that ye increase, Auth. and remaining $V_{v}$. Still more] More, Wicl., Rhem. ; more and more, AUTH. and remaining Vv. (yet m. and m., Cov.). See ver. 2.

In. To study] That ye st., Auth. Your hands] So Wicl., Cov. Test.: your own h., AOTH. and remaining Vv. According as] As, Auth. and all $V_{v}$.
12. In order that] That, Aठтн. and all Vv.

Becomingly] Honestly, Auth. and all Vv. The translation 'seemly' deserves consideration, but is appy. open to the objection that in point of strict etymology such a form of the adverb is somewhat doubtful; see Trench, on Auth. Vers. ch. II. p. 3 I.
have] That ye may have, Autr.
Need] Lack, AUTH. Noman]
So Auth. Marg.: nothing, Auth. The clause is translated, and that nothinge be lackynge vnto you, by Trnd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. (in you).
13. Now] But, Aठтн., Bish. ; forsothe, Wicl. ; and, RHEM. : the remaining five Versions omit $\delta \in \in$ in translation. We] *I, Autir. That] Which,
Aute. Are sleeping] Are *asleep, Auth., Gen.; are fallen a slepe, Tynd., Cov., Cran.; slepe, Cov. Test., Bish., Rhem. For $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ к. Wicl. has
simply of men slepyng (or dyinge). The rest] Others, Auth., Rhem.; other, Wiol. and the six remaining $V$ v.
14. Them that are laid to sleep through Jesus] Them also which sleep in Jesus, Aঠth. : no Version has attempted to express the Aorist participle.
15. In] So all Vv. except AOth., GEN., by. Which are living and are remaining behind] Which are alive and remain, AणTH.; that lyuen that ben residue (or lefte), WIcl.; which live and are remayninge, Trnd., Cov., Gen.; that lyue, whych remayne, Cov. Test. ; whych shall lyue, \& shall remayne, Cran.; whiche lyue, remayning, BISH. ; vvhich liue, vvhich are remaining, REEM. It is not easy to give these words a perfectly accurate and perfectly idiomatic translation: 'we the living, the remaining, \&c.' would be accurate, but bald; 'we the living who are, dec.' somewhat harsh and appositional. We therefore may perhaps not unwisely retain the 'and,' and also (with AOTH.) omit the second relative in translation, as tending to overload the sentence. The slight addition 'behind' seems suggested bv the compound repi入єime $\theta a l$, the prep. probably marking the idea of over. plus, and thence, in the present context, of a continuance on earth and
living and are remaining behind unto the coming of the Lord shall in no wise prevent them that are laid to sleep: 16 because the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first;
I7 then we which are living and are remaining behind shall be caught up at the same time together with them in clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever
18 be with the Lord. So then comfort one another with these words.
V. But concerning the times and the seasons, brethren, 2 ye have no need to be written to. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in 3 the night. When they shall say Peace and safety; then doth destruction come suddenly upon them, as travail
survival ; comp. Herod. I. 82.
Shall in no wise] Shall not, Aurl. and all $V_{v}$. Great caution is required in the translation of ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ in the N.T., as in some cases it appears very doubtful whether any emphatic negation is really contemplated by the writer, and whether the formula was not due to that general tendency to strengthened negation which is often observable in later Greek. Perhaps the simplest and best rule is to be guided by the context,-which here seems to require the stronger form of translation.
Prevent] If it be thought necessary to alter this now obsolete word, we may have recourse to the more modern 'precede:' archaisms however as such are not altered in this Revision.
Them that are laid to sleep] Them which are asleep, Avtr.: see note on ver. 14.
16. Because] For, Avtr. and all Vv. In the following words it is perhaps doubtful whether the order of the Greek, which places катаß ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau а є$ aंm oúpapồ last, might not be advantageously retained, as indeed it is by

Wicl., Rhey. It tends however to throw appy. a greater stress on these words than is conveyed by the original.
17. Are living, \&c.] Are alive, and remain, Auth.: see note on ver. 15 . At the same-them] Together with them, Aurb., Wicl., Cov. Test., Bisr. ; with them also, Trnd., Cov., Cran., Gen. ; vvithal...vvith them, Rhem. On the translation of ä $\mu a$ oùv aưzois, see notes in loc. In clouds] So Wiol. : in the clouds, Auta, and remaining $\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}$.
18. So then] Wherefore, Adte. and the other $V \mathrm{v}$. except Wicl., \& so; and Rнем., therfore.

Chapter V. I. Concerning] Of, Auti, and all V . $\quad$ To be written to] To wryte vnto you, Cov.; that we do wryt vnto you, Cov. Test.; that vee verite to you, R⿴em.; that I write unto you, Абтн, and remaining Vv. (Wicl., to).
3. When] *For when, Aute.

Doth destruction come suddenly] Sudden destruction cometh, Абтн. : alфиі-
upon a woman with child; and they shall in no wise escape. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that the 4 day should overtake you as a thief. For ye all are sons 5 of light, and sons of the day : we are not of the night, nor of darkness. Accordingly then let us not sleep, even as 6 do the rest; but let us watch and be sober. For they 7 that sleep sleep in the night; and they that be drunken are drunken in the night. But let us, as we are of the 8 day, be sober, having put on the breastplate of faith and love, and as an helmet the hope of salvation; because 9 God did not appoint us unto wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, 10 whether we watch or sleep, we should together live with him. Wherefore comfort each other, and edify one the II other, even as also ye do.

סoos is a 'secondary predication of manner,' a force preserved by no Version. In no wise] Not, Aणtr. and all Vv . ; see notes on ch. iv. 15 (Transl.).
4. The day] The ilke d., WicL.; the same d., Rebu. ; that d., Auth. and remaining Vv. (Cov. Test. omits one that appy. by mistake). It may be doubted whether the text is here so explicit as Acti.; the translation however of the article by a pronoun is so hazardous, and so erroneous in principle, that the cases are but very few in which idiom or perspicuity can be alowed to prevail over the literal rendering : comp. 2 Thess. iii. 14.
5. For ye all are] * Ye are all, Actr. Independently of the insertion of $\gamma{ }^{\text {a }}$, which is required by Manuscript authority, it seems better to give to 'all' a prominence corresponding to that of $\pi$ ávres in the Greek.

Sons
(bis)] Similarly Wicl. (the sones... sones) : the children, Аотн. and remaining Vv.; but Cov. omits the article in both cases, and Rhem. omits it in the second.
6. Accordingly then] Therefore, Auti. and all Vv. Even as] As, Auth. The rest] The other, Cov. Teet.: others, Adti., Reem.; other, Tynd. and remaining $\mathrm{V} v$.
8. As we are] Who are, Aסti. : all Versions insert a relative.
Having put on] Putting on, Auti.: see notes in loc. As an helmet] So Tynd.: for an helmet, Adtr., Cran., Gen.
9. Because] For, Auth. and all Vv. Did not appoint ] Hath not appointed, Аотн. and the other Vv . except Wicl. (puttide not). Through] So Cov. Test.: by, Adth., Wicl., Bish., Rhem.; by the meanes of, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.
10. Watch]So Rhem. : wake, Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} \text {.: see ver. } 6 . ~}^{6}$
Together live] Live together, АЈтн. and all $V \nabla$.; see notes.
11. Each other] Your selves together, Adth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish.; one another, Cov. Test., Gen., Reem. One the other] Eche other, WIoL.; euery one another, Cran., Bise.; one another, AUti. and remaining $V$ v.

Now we beseech you, brethren, to regard them which labour among you, and preside over you in the Lord, and love for their work's sake. Be at peace among yourselves. Moreover we exhort you, brethren, admonish the disorderly, encourage the feeble minded, support the render evil for evil to any man; but alway follow after that which is good towards one another and towards all men. Rejoice alway; pray without ceasing; in every thing give thanks, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus toward you. Quench not the Spirit ; despise not prophesyings: but prove all things; hold fast that which is good. Abstain from every form of evil. But may the 23
12. Now] So Gen.: and, Autr., Cov. Test., Bish., Rhem. ; Tynd., Cov., Cran., omit.

Regard] Know, Autr. and all $V_{v}$.
Preside over] Are over, Auth., Gen.; ben bifore to, Wicl.; have the oversight of, Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Bish.; gouerne, RHEM.
13. Very exceedingly] Very highly, Auth.: seenotes on ch. iii. 10(Transl.). Be at peace] So Grn. ; and sim. Wicl., Cov. Test., Reem., omit and (following the Vulg., and giving hauve p.): and be at $p$., Aort. and remaining Vv.
14. Moreover] Now, Adti.; and, Cov. Test., Rhem. ; forsothe, Wicl. ; the five remaining $V \mathbf{r}$. omit.
Admonish] So Grn., Rhem. : reproue yee (or chastise), Wicl.; rebuke, Cov. Test.; warn, Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish. The disorderly] Vnquyete men, Widl. ; the enquiet, ReEm. ; them that are unruly, Aotr. and 6 remaining VV. (Adth. Marg., disorderly). Encourage] Comfort, Auth. and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} .}$ : see notes on ch. ii. ir. Be longsuffering] Have continuall pacience, Tynd.; be patient, Auth. and remaining Vv.
(Wiol., be yee p.).
15. None] So Auth. and the other Vr. except Wicl., Cov. Test., no man. It may be remarked that Auti. and the older $V^{\text {r. }}$. appy. always adopt the form 'none,' not 'no one.'
Alway]So Cov.Test., Rhem. (alvvaies): evermore, Wiol.; ever, Auth, and remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}} \quad$ Follow after] So Adth. in I Tim. vi. iI : sue, WICL.; pursue, Rhem.; follow, Adte. and 6 remaining $V_{\nabla}$. Towards one another] Sim., towarde your selues, Gen.; tovvards eche other, Rнем.: *both among yourselves, Adth., Trnd., Cov., Cov. Test. (om. both), Cran., Bish. Wiol. gives simply to gedir. See ch. iii. 12. Towards (2)] So Cov. Test., Gen., Rhem.: to, Auth, and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$ (Wicl., into).
16. Alway] So Cov. (both), Rhem. (alvaaies) : evermore, A才ti., Gen., Wicl.; ever, Tynd., Cran., Bish.
18. Toward]So Tynd.,Cov. (both), Craf., Gen., Bise.: concerning, Adth. ; in, Wicl., Rhem. (so Vulg.).
21. But prove] *Prove, Aणti.
22. Every form of evil] All appear. ance of evil, Auth., Gen., Bise.,

God of peace Himself sanctify you wholly ; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept whole without blame in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is He 24 that calleth you, who also will do it.

Brethren, pray for us. Salute all the brethren with $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 26\end{aligned}$ an holy kiss. I adjure you by the Lord that the epistle 27 be read to all the [holy] brethren.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. 28

Reem.; exyl spice (or lickenesse), Wicl. ; all suppicious thinges, Tynd., Cov. (both) ; all ewell appearaunce, Cban.
23. But] Forsothe, Wicl. ; now, Gen.; and, Adtr., Bish., Reem.; omitted by Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran. May the God of peace Himself] So Rhem. but omitting may: the same god of pees, Wicl.; the very God of peace, A0tr. and remaining $\mathrm{V} v$.
And may] That, Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem. ; and I pray God, Auth. and remaining Vv. (all but AUTH. adding that). Your spirit...whole] So Wicl.: your whole spirit, Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$ : see especially notes in loc. Kept So WıcL., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen. : preserved,

Adth., Cran., Bish., Rhem. Without blame] So RHem. : blameless, Adth., Cov. (both), Gen., Bish.; with outen pleynte, Wicl.; fautlesse, Tynd.; so that in nothyng ye maye be blamed, Cran. In] So Wiol., Cov. Test., Cran., Bish., Rhem.: unto, Auth., Trnd., Cov., Gen.
26. Salute]So RHEM. : greet, Auth. and remaining $V_{v}$. (Wicl., grete yee wel).
27. Adjure] So Avti. Marg., RHEM., and sim. coniure, Wicl.: charge, Autif. and 6 remaining Vv. The epistle] This Ep., Auti. and all Vv. : see notes on 2 Thess. iii. 14 (Transl.).
28. With you] Adti. adds *Amen.

## THE

## SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}$ AUL and Silvanus and Timothy to the church of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus
2


3 brethren, as it is meet, because that your faith increaseth exceedingly, and the love of every one of you all towards 4 each other aboundeth; so that we ourselves make our boast in you in the churches of God, for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and the afflictions that ye 5 endure;-which is a token of the righteous judgment of
t. Timothy] So Wicl., Reem.: Timotheus, AणTн. and remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\text {. }}$ : see notes on Col. i. I (Transl.).
2. Grace be] So Tynd., Cov. (botb), Cran., Gen.: grace, Auth., Wicl., Bise., Rhem. For $\dot{v} \mu \nu$ Tynd., Cov., Gen., give with you; the six remaining Vv. giving to (or unto) you.
3. Give thanks to] So Cov. Test. (vnto), Rem., and Auth. in I Thess. i. 2: do thankyngis...to, WIcL.; thank, Aoti. and 5 remaining Vv . Increaseth] So Cov. Test., Rhem.: waxith, Wicl.; groweth, AUTH. and remaining $V \mathrm{v}$. However Cov . Test. omits exceedingly, and Wicl. gives euer(? reading semper cr.) before waxith. Love] So Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish. : charity, Adth., Wicl., Rhem.; comp. notes on I Tim. i. 5 (Transl.).
4. Make our boast in] Similarly, make oure boast of, Cov. ; make boast of, Cov. Test. ; boast of, Cran.; glory in, Аотн., Wicl., Rhem. ; reioyce of, Tynd., Gen.; reioyce in, Bish.
The affictions] Tribulations, Auth. and the nther Vr. except Cov. (both), troubles. No Version inserts the article.
5. Token] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.: manifest token, Auth.; ensaumple, Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem. Ye are also suffering] \& yee suffren, Wicl.; also you suffer, Rнеи.; ye also suffer, AUTH, and remaining Vv. The change appears to have two advantages, first, that it more distinctly preserves the association of kal and $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, and secondly, that it conveys more fully the present and continuing

God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye are also suffering. If so be that it is a 6 righteous thing with God to recompense to them that afflict you affliction; and to you who are afflicted rest with us, 7 at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of His power in flame of fire, rendering vengeance 8 to those who know not God, and those who obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus. Who shall suffer punishment, 9 even eternal destruction away from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might, when He shall come to 10
nature of the trials of the Thessalonians.
6. If so be that] So Auth. in Rom. viii. 9, 17, 1 Cor, xv. 15, 2 Cor. v. 3, 1 Pet. ii. 3 : seeing, Aరth.; yif netheles, Wicl.; verely, Tynd., Cran.; for, Cov. (both), Gen., Bish. ; if yet, RHem. To them that affict you affiction] Fildynge to hem that turblen you, Wicl.; tribulation, to them that vexe you, Rнем.; tribulation to them that trouble you, Auri. and remaining Vv . [Cov. (both), vnto]. The change seems to preserve more clearly the antithesis, and also to bring more into prominence the 'lex talionis' that is tacitly referred to.
7. Afflicted] Troubled, AणTH. and the other Vv. except RHEm., vexed: see previous note. At the revelation of] So Bish., RHem. (both giving in); in the schewynge of, $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{ICL}}$. ; in the appearyng of, Cov. Test. : when...shall be revealed, ADth.; when ...shall shewe him silfe, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. The angels of His power] So Aoth. Marg., Cov. (both), Cran., Bish., Rhem., and sim. Wicl. (a. of his vertue) : his mighty Angels, Auth., Tynd., Gen.
8. In flame of fire] So Rhem., and sim. Wicl. and Cov. Teat. (thefl.): in flaming fire, Auth., Tynd., Gen., Bish. ; with fl. f., Cov., Cran.
Rendering vengeance to] So Tynd.,

Gen., Bisf. (all giving vnto) : taking vengeance on, Auth. Cran. gives the transl. of the text, but has a different construction, whych shall rēdre $v$. vnto. Those who (bis) $]$ Them that...that, AUTH. Lord Jesus] Lord Jesus *Christ, Aбтн.
9. Shall suffer punishment, even] Shall be punished with, AUTh. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. Test., RHum., which follow the Vulg. poenas dabunt in interilu aeternas.
Eternal]So RHEm. : everlasting, A0tr. and remaining Vv . Though here the change is really unimportant, it is still perhaps best to translate this word uniformly, except where the context seems specially and exclusively to imply simple duration. In the present case the alóvtos is equally qualitative and quantitative.
A way from] From, Auth. and all Vv. Face] So Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem. : presence, Auth. and remaining $V v$. Mighty] So Adth. in Eph. vi. ro: vertue, Wicl.; power, Aणтн. and remaining Vv.
ro. Shall come] So A Oth. and all Vv. There is some little difficulty in the translation of ötav with the aor. subj. Perhaps, as a general rule, it may be said that when the exact rendering 'shall have' is inapplicable (see notes on Tit. iii. 12, Transl.), we may conveniently adopt in transla-
be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believed (because our testimony to you-ward was beI I lieved) in that day. Whereunto we also pray always for you, that our God may count you worthy of your calling and fulfil every good pleasure of goodness and the work of
12 faith with power; that the name of our Lord Jesus may be glorified in you, and ye in Him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.
II. Now we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto
2 Him, that ye be not quickly shaken from your sober mind, nor yet be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word nor by letter as coming through us, to the effect that the 3 day of the Lord is now come. Let no man deceive you in any way; because the day shall not come except there
tion the present (indic. or conj.) when the reference to the actual futurity of the subsequent event is less specially contemplated (comp. Matth. xxi. 40, Mark iv. 29 [Rec.], al.), and future when, as here, such a reference is more distinct and prominent.
That believed] That *believe, Avтн.
To you-ward] Sim., toward you, Bish.; that we had vnto you, Tynd., Cran. (to); vnto you, Cov.: among yøu, AणTн.
ir. Whereunto] Wherefore, Auth. We also] So Gen.: we, Trnd., Cov.; also we, Aute, and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
May] So Gen. : would, Auti., Bisb.; royll, Cov. Test., Cran. ; the four remaining $V \nabla$. omit the auxiliary.
Your] This, Adtr., Cran.; his, Wiel., Cov. Test., Gen., Rhem.; the, Tind., Cov., Bish. Every good pleasure of $g$.] So Bise. (all): all the good pleasure of his $g$., Auth., Gen., Rhem.
12. Lord Jesus] Lord Jesus *Christ, Auth.

Chapter II. i. Touching] By, Auth. and all $V_{v .}$ : see notes in loc.

And our] So Wicl.: and by our, Auth., Gen., Bish.
2. Quickly] Soon, Auth., WIcl.; sodenly, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; hastely, Cov. Test.; easily, Rhey. From your sober mind] Similarly, fro youre witte, Wicl.; from youre mynde, Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish.; from your sense, Rhem.: Auth. alone gives the incorrect in mind.

Nor yet be]
Nor be, Cov. Test., Cran., Bish., Rhem.: nor, Gen.; or be, Auti.; nether be yee, Wicl.; and be not, Tynd., Cov.

Coming through]
From, Auth. Although סcà occurs four times in this verse, it is not worth while to overweight the sentence by translating it uniformly through. $\quad$ To the effect that] As that, Adtr. This slight change seems to make the meaning a little more perspicuous. The Lord] *Christ, Auth. Now come] At hand, Auti. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., nyg.
3. In any way] In any maner, Wicl. ; by any means, Auth. and
come the falling away first, and the Man of Sin be revealed, the son of perdition; he that opposeth, and ex- 4 alteth himself against every one called God or an object of worship; insomuch that he sitteth in the temple of God, displaying himself that he is God. Remember ye 5 not that when I was yet with you I used to tell you these things? And now ye know what restraineth, that 6 he may be revealed in his own time. For the mystery 7 of lawlessness is already working, yet only until he who now restraineth be taken out of the way. And then 8
remaining Vv. Because] For, Displaying himself] Shewing himself, Auth. and all Vv. The day shall not come] So Adtr., Gen. (both giving that d.) : the lorde commeth not, Tynd., Cov. (both); the Lorde shall not come, Cran., $\ddagger$ ish. ; no clause is supplied by Wicl. or Reem.
The falling away] A falling away, Auti., Bish. ; departynge aweye (or discencoñ, Wicl.; a reuolt, Rhem.; a departynge, Tynd., Cran., Gen.; the dep., Cov. (both), which alone of all the $\mathrm{V} v$. rightly give the article.
The Man of Sin] So Wicl., Rhem.: that man of sin, Auth., Cov., Gen., Bish.; that synfull man, Trnd., Cran.; the s. man, Cov. Test.
4. He that opposeth] Who opposeth, Adth.; that is aduersarie, Wicl.; whych is the adu., Cov. Test.; which is an adv., Tynd. and five remaining Vv. It will thus be seen that the Vv. rightly recognise the substantival character of $\dot{\sigma} a^{\prime} \nu \tau \iota \kappa \epsilon l \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$, and unite $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. solely with the following participle. Against] So GEN. : rpon, Wicl.; above, Acti. and remaining $\mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}$. Every one called] All that is called, Autr. and all Vv. except Wicl. (alle thing that is seyde). An object of worship] That is worshipped, Aoti. and the other Vv. except Cov., Gods seruyce. Insomuch] So Cov. Test.: so, Auth. and remaining Vv. He sitteth] He *as God s., Aঠtr.

Auth., Wicl., Gen., Bish., Reem.; and shew him silfe, Trnd. (giving shall sitt above); and boasteth himselfe, Cov.; boastynge hym self, Cov. Test., Cran.
5. Used to tell] Told, Auth.: n) Version attempts to give the force of the imperfect.
6. Restraineth] Withholdeth, Adtr. and the other Vv . except Cov. Test., doth withholde; and Rhem., letteth. There does not seem any reason for supplying the pronoun 'him,' with Scholef. (Hints, p. ir6, ed. 4): we seem bound to preserve the mysterious indefiniteness of the original: Cov. (both) supply it. May be] So Cov. Test., Reev. : be, Wicl.; might be, A tтi. and remaining Vv.
His own] His, Auth. and all Vv.
7. Lawlessness] Iniquity, Aоте. and all Vv. except WrcL., wickidnesse. But Trnd. gives that in., and Cov., Cran., give the in. It seems desirable here to retain this more rigidly literal translation as serving more clearly to indicate the essential character of $\tau$ ò катé $\chi 0 \%$ Is already working] Doth already work, Auth., Cran., Gen., Bish. Yet only until, \&c.] Similarly, tyll he which now onely letteth, Cov., Cran., Bish.; only he who now letteth, will let, until he, Auth.; onely that he that holdith nowe, holde, til it, Wicl. ; which onlie loketh, vntill
shall the Lawless One be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus shall consume with the breath of His mouth, and
9 shall destroy with the appearance of His coming ; whose coming is after the working of Satan in all power and ro signs and wonders of lying, and in all deceit of unrighteousness to them that are perishing; because they embraced not the love of the truth, that they might be
II saved. And for this cause doth God send them a work12 ing of error that they should believe the lie; that they may all of them be judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.
$i t$, Tynd.; only he that holdeth, let hym holde now, tyll he, Cov. Test.; onely he which now withholdeth, shal let til he, Gen.; only that he vohich novv holdeth, doe hold, wntil he, Rhem. The insertion of 'yet' may perhaps be admitted as slightly clearing up the elliptical expression.
8. The Lawless One] That wicked, Adty., Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Bish. : the ilke wickide (man), Wicl.; the wicked man, Gen.; that vicked one, Reem. The Lord Jesus] The Lord, Aотн. omitting *Jesus. Breath] Spirit, Autr. and all Vv. Appearance] So Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran.; brightmess, Adth., Gen., Bish. ; illumynynge (or schynynge), Wicl.; manifestation, Reem. The regular translation of this word in AOTI. is 'appearing' (I Tim. vi. I4, 2 Tim. i. 10, iv. I, 8, Tit. ii. 13), which is here slightly changed to avoid the juxtaposition of two participial substantives.
9. Whose] Hym whos, Wicl., Rhem.: even hin whose, Aoti. and remaining $\left.V_{V .} \quad I n\right]$ So Wicl., Cov. Test., Bish., Reem. : with, Avin. and remaining Vv . Wonders of lying] So Bish. : lying wonders, Aote., Cov. Test., Gen.

Io. And $i n]$ So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. Test., Gen., Bish., Reem.: and
with, Auth., Cov., Cran.
Deceit] So Wicl., Cov. Test. : seducing, Rhem.; deceivableness, Aытн. and remaining $V_{\nabla}$. To them] So Wicl., Cov. Test. (vnto), Rhem.: in them, Auth., Bish.; amonge them, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.
Are perishing] Perish, Auth. and all Vv. Embraced] Received, Auth.

1. Doth God send] God *shall send, Aоte. A working of error] So Wicl. : the operacion of erroure, Cov. Test., Reem.; strong delusion, Avti. and remaining $V^{\prime}$.: see ver. 9 . Though in both cases the introduction of the adjective 'effectual' before 'working' might be rendered suitable by the context, it is still, lexically considered, somewbat too strong as a purely literal rendering. It would thus seem perhaps better to strike out 'effectual' in Eph. iii. 7, iv. I6, or to retain it only in italics. These are however points which it is very difficult to adjust, for if the one translation is too strong, the other certainly seems somewhat too weak: 'energy,' which is adopted by some translators, is appy. too modern. The lie] A lie, Aбтн.
2. That they may all of them] That they "all might, Aote.; that alle, Wicl.; that all they myght, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bise.; that all

But we are bound to give thanks to God alway for 13 you, brethren beloved of the Lord, that God chose you from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and faith in the truth: whereunto He called you 14 by our Gospel, unto the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. Accordingly then, brethren, stand 15 fast, and hold the traditions which ye were taught whether by word or by our epistle. But may our Lord Jesus 16 Christ Himself, and God our Father, which loved us, and gave us eternal comfort and good hope in grace, comfort 17 your hearts, and stablish you in every good work and word.
they maye, Cov. Test.; that al may, Rhey. The two slight changes are made to preserve the reading änavtes, and the correct sequence of tenses; comp. Latham, Engl. Lang. § 539 (ed. 4). Judged] So Rhem. : demyde (or dampnyde), Wicl. ; damned, Auth. and remaining $V_{v}$.
Had pleasure in] On the transl. of cúdoкєîv, see note on 1 Thess. ii. 8 (Transl.).
13. To God alway] Alway to God, AOtr.: there is here no necessity for deserting the order of the original.
That] So Wicl., Cov. Test., Rhem.: because, Avth.; for because that, Tynd., Cran.; bec. that, Cov., Gen., Bish. Chose you from the beginning] Hath from the beginning chosen you, Adtr. All Vv. except Wicl. (chees) give hath chosen. In ( I )] So Wicl., Cov. (both), Bish., Rhem. : through, Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen. Faith in the truth] Feith of treuthe, Wicl., Gen. (the f.), Bish. (the tr.), Reem. (the tr.): belief of the truth, Аоті.
14. Our Lord] The Lord, Avti.
15. Accordingly then] Therefore, AUTH. and the other $V \mathrm{~V}$. except Wicl., and so. Traditions] So Aणтн., Wicl. [tr. (or techyngis)], Rhem. The other Vv. vary; ordinaunces, Tynd., Cov. (hoth), Cran., Bish.; instructions,

Gen. : see note on ch. iii. 6 (Transl.). Were taught] Have been taught, Autr. : no Version preserves the correct force of the Aorist.

By our] So Wicl., Cov. Test., Gen., Bish., Rhem. : our, Adth. ; by, Tynd., Cov., Cran., all expressing $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ with $\lambda_{o}$ ouv.
16. But may] Now, AUti.

God our Father] God *even our Father, AOTI.: see especially notes in loc.;
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{y}$, notes on Gal. i. 4 (Transl.). Loved] So Wiol. : hath loved, Adtr. and remaining $V_{v}$. Gave] So Wicl.: hath given, Aote. and remaining $V \mathbf{v}$. [Cov. (both) however omit the second hath, see previous note]. Eternal] So Rhem. : everlasting, Auth. and remaining $V \mathrm{v}$.; see notes on ch. i. 9 (Transl.). Comfort] Consolation, Adtr. The change is only made to preserve the same rendering for $\pi а \rho \alpha ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \omega . . . \pi а \rho a \kappa a \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma a l$, and indeed is given by Adte. in 2 Cor. i. 3, 4. In grace] So Wicl., Cov. Test., Bish., Rhem.: through gr., AJth. and the four remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
17. Stablish you] Avte. retains you in ordinary type, but contrary to the best authorities; see notes.
Work and word] *Word and work, AUTH.
III. Finally pray ye for us, brethren, that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified, even as it is 2 also with you: and that we may be delivered from perverse 3 and wicked men ; for it is not all that have Faith. But faithful is the Lord, who shall stablish you and keep you 4 from the Wicked One. Yea we have confidence in the Lord touching you, that ye both do and will do the things 5 which we command. But may the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God and into the patience of Christ.
6 Now we command you, bretbren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly, and not after the tradition

Chapter III. r. Pray ye for us, brethren] Brethren, pray for us, Auth. Perhaps this changed order better represents the prominent position of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon$ '́रє $\sigma \theta \epsilon$. Free course] In the earliest copies of AUTH. 'free' is marked as an insertion, but it may fairly be considered as involved in $\tau \rho \epsilon \in \chi \eta$. Even as it is also] Even as it is, Autr. The change gives a juster equivalent to кat ${ }^{\text {iss }}$ кal. See however notes on 1 Thess. i. 5 (Transl.).
2. Perverse] Vncouenable (or noyous), Wicl.; importune, Cov. Test.; importunate, Rнем.;-representing Vulg. importunis; disordered, Bisi.; unreasonable, Auth. and 4 remaining Vv. It is not all, \&c.] All men have not faith, Auth. and the other V v. except Wicl., feith is not of alle men; and Cov., faith is not euery mass.
3. Faithful is the Lord] The Lord is faithful, Aute, and the other Vv. (our L., Rhem.) except Wicl. (the l. is trewe). Independently of the change of order agreeing better with that of the original, the paronomasia caused by the juxtaposition of $\pi i \sigma \tau \tau$ and rifoòs is more distinctly preserved. The Wicked One] Evil, Auth. and all $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$; see notes in loc.

It is of no moment whether movipou be translated 'evil' or 'wicked' but the rendering should be kept that is given in ver 2.
4. Yea] And, Auth., Gen., Bish., Reem.; sothely, Wicl.; the rest, Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., omit $\delta e ́$ in translation. Command] Command $\boldsymbol{y}$ you, Auth.
5. But may] Forsothe, WIcL. ; and, AUTH. and the other Vv. except Cov., which omits $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in translation.
Patience of Christ] So Auth. Marg., Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Reem.: palient waiting for Christ, Aठtr., Cran., Bish.; weating for of Christ, Gen.
6. The Lord] *Our Lord, Auth. Walking] So Rhem.; sim. Wicl. (wandrynge): AUTH. (that walketh) and remaining $V v$. insert the relative. Though the meaning is practically the same, it still seems desirable in translation, when consistent with our idiom, to mark the anarthrous participle. Tradition] So Auth., Wicl., Rhem.: institucion, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish.; ordinaunce, Cov. Test. ; instruction, Gen. If any change be thought necessary, the last of these translations is perhaps to be preferred.
which they received of us. For yourselves know how ye 7 ought to follow us; in that we behaved not disorderly among you, neither ate we bread from any man for 8 naught, but with toil and travail, working night and day that we might not be burdensome to any of you: not that 9 we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample 10 to you that ye should follow us. For also when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any will not work, neither let him eat. For we hear that there are it some walking among you disorderly, working at no business, but being busy-bodies. Now them that are such we 12 command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread. But ye, 13

They received] *He received, Auth.
7. In that] For, Aणтн. and all Vv.; see notea in loc. Behaved not] Behaved not ourselves, Avth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
8. Ate we bread from any man] Did we eat any mans bread, Auth. It seems desirable here, with all Vv. except Wicl., to invert the order of the Greek, that $\delta \omega \rho \in a^{\prime} \nu$ which occupies the emphatic place in Greek may occupy the same place in the English, -that place being not uncommonly in our language the last. But with toil ...working] But wrought with labour, AUTH.: the present transl. preserves the true connection, and avoids the incorrect rendering of tepya $\}\langle\mu \in \boldsymbol{c} \boldsymbol{c}$ by the finite verb. That we...any] Similarly, lest vve should burden any, Rнем. : that we might not be chargeable to any, AUTH.; lest we shulde be c. to eny, Cov. (both) ; because we wolde not be c. to eny, Cran., Gen., Bish. ; that we greueden none, Wiol.; because we wolde not be grevous to eny, Tynd.
9. Not that] Not because, AUTH.; not as, Wicl.; not as though, Cov. Test., RHEM. That ye should]

For to, Wicl., Rhem.; to, Auth, and remaining $V \mathbf{V}$.
10. For also] So Cov. Test., RHem. : for even, AUTH., GEN.; and, Cov.; for, Tynd., Cran., Bish., omitting kal in translation. Will not] So Wict. (wole not), RHEM.: would not, AUTH. and remaining $V_{8}$. Neither let him] So Rhem. ; and sim. (nether ete he) WICL.: neithershouldhe eat, Auth.; that the same shuld not eate, Trnd., and Cov. (both), Cran., Bish.,-these four omitting that; that he shulde not eat, Gen.
s I. Walking] Which walk, AutH. No Version gives a participial rendering : see notes on ver. 6.
Working at no business] Working not at all, Aотн. This is perhaps the only way in which the paronomasia $\epsilon \rho \gamma a \zeta \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$ ous... $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \rho \gamma a \zeta \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$ ous can be maintained. The word 'business' is supplied by Autr. in I Thess. iv. 1 I. Being busybodies] So Cban.: are busybodies, Auth., Tynd., Cov.' (both), Gen., Bish. (be b.) ; doinge curiously, Wicl. ; curiously meddling, RHem.
12. In the Lord] *By our Lord, AUTH.

14 brethren, lose not heart in well doing. But if any man obey not our word by the epistle, mark this man, and keep no company with him, that he may be shamed. 15 And count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as 16 a brother. But may the Lord of peace Himself give you peace continually, in every way. The Lord be with you all.
13. Lose not heart] Be not* weary, Auth.
14. But if] So Cov.: and if, Adte., Reicm. If 'but' be objected to in consequence of the 'but' in ver. 13 , it would then seem better with Tynd., Cov. Test., Cran., Gen., Bish., to omit $\delta \dot{\xi}$ in translation.
Obey not] So Auth. and the other Vv. except WioL., schal not obeye; and Cov. Test., doth not obey. At first sight the latter translation might seem preferable, but considered strictly, it would seem to imply that such would probably be the case (see Latham, Eng. Lang. § 537 , ed. 4), whereas the Greek $\epsilon l$ with the indic. 'per se nihil significat proter conditionem' (Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 455). It may thus be best as a general rule, only to adopt the indicative in English where either (a) the context or circumstances of the case corroborate the likelihood of the assumed case, or (b) where the speaker appears to regard it as a matter of fact. The possibility of inserting after 'if'the words 'as is matter of fact,' or 'as seems to be matter of fact,' will commonly facilitate decision. The epistle] This Epistle, AUTH. All the other Vv. except Wioc. (oure worde bi epistle) join $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ with $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \omega \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta \epsilon$, and translate $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ by the English indefnite article. This perhaps, with I Thess. v. 27, might be considered as one of the few cases in
which idiom and euphony may justify us in retaining the pronominal translation : as however coûtov occurs directly after, it would involve the necessity of translating it that man, as AUTH., or hym, as Wicl. and all other Vv. Scholefield (Hints, p. ir8, ed 4) proposes 'our epistle,' but this is scarcely suitable after the preceding ' our word' where the 'our' is a translation of $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, as it would seem to imply that it was repeated with $\delta<\dot{\alpha}$
 note, Adti., Gen., Reem.; sende vs worde of, Trnd., Cov., Cran.; shewe vs of, Cov. Test.; signifie, Bist.
This man] That man, Avin. : hym, Wicl. and remaining $V \mathrm{v}$.
Keep no company] So Autr. in I Cor. v. II : comyne yee not, Wicl. ; do not companie, Ruem. : haue nothinge to do, Cov. (both); have no company, Aute. and four remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Shamed] Ashamed, AUTH. : the slight change brings to notice the passive sense.
15. And] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. Test., Cran., Remm. : yet, Auth., Cov., Gen., Bish.
16. But may] Now, Adtr., Gen., Bish.; forsothe, WICL. ; and, RHEM.; Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., omit $\delta \dot{t}$ in translation. Peace continually, in every way] Euerlastynge pees in al place, Wicl., and Cov. Test., Rhem., giving euery place; always, by all
sign in every epistle: so I write. The grace of our Lord 18 Jesus Christ be with you all. [Amen.]
means, Avth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. with myne awne honde, Trnd., Cov. 17. By the hand of me Paul] So (both), Cran., Ger., Bise. A sign] Autr. in Col. iv. 18 : of Paul, with So Wicl. (om. a), Rhem. : the token, mine own hand, Auth. ; of me Paul Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Since the above was written a much more useful and better arranged Grammar has come under my notice, viz. Brevis Linguce Armeniace Grammatica, by J. H. Petermann (Berol.

[^1]:    1841). It has a simple Cbrestomathy and good Glossary, but no Syntax. The standard Grammar of a larger size appears to be that of Cirbied. [1861].

[^2]:    r. Timothy] So Wros.; Cran., labour, Auth. and the remaining Vr. Reem. : Timotheus, Auth. and remaining Vv. See notes on Col. i. I (Transl.). In God] So all Vv. except Auth., GEN., which is in God,-an unnecessary and inexact addition, not adopted by AOTH. in the parallel passage 2 Thess. i. 1. And the Lord] So WICL., Cov. Test., Rhem. (our L.): and in the Lord, Auth. and remaining Vv. The addition of 'in' seems unnecessary, and is best reserved for those cases where it is expressed in the Greek, or where, as in I Tim. vi. 9 (see notes), there are contextual reasons for its introduction. The mistakes caused by such insertions are well noticed by Blunt, Parish Priest, p. 56. And peace] AUTH. adds * from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.
    3. Toil] Similarly Wicc., traueyl:
    exceptGen., diligent loue. Though 'labour of love' has from the alliteration become familiar to the ear, it seems desirable here to maintain the more strict translation of кbros: see notes in loc. In the presence of] So AUTH. in ch. ii. 19: in the sight of, Aणtr. and the other Vv. except WICL., Cov. (both), Rhem., before. It is of little moment which of these translations is adopted; but as the expression $\notin \mu \pi \rho$. тô̂ $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ is only used by St Paul in this Epistle, it should be similarly translated throughout.
    4. Beloved of God, your el.] So Adth. Marg., Cov. Test., RHem., and (giving how that ye are electe) Tynd., Cov., Cran.: beloved, your election of God, Aотн., Bish., and sim. Gen. (that ye are elect of God).
    5. Because] For, Auth. and all

